



भारत का राजपत्र

The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं. 36]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, सितम्बर 7, 1974/भाद्र 16, 1896

No. 36] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1974/BHADRA 16, 1896

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या वी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके

Separate paging is given to this part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (ii)

PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय को छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ राज्य भेद प्रशासनों को छोड़कर)
केन्द्रीय प्राधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किये गये सांबिधिक प्रावेश और अधिसूचनाएँ।

**Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India
(other than the Ministry of Defence) by Central Authorities
(other than the Administrations of Union Territories)**

भारत निर्वाचन प्रायोग

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 9 अगस्त, 1974

सं. ग्रा० 2265—यह, निर्वाचन प्रायोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए साधारण निवाचन के लिए 214-बल्लोली (अ० जा०) निवाचन क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री छन्नारकी इण्डिया चन्द्रपा, मार्किन कृष्ण इलेक्ट्रिकल स्टोर्म, डाकघराने के गामने, बागलकोट, कनाटक, लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रथिनियम, 1951 तथा नद्दीन बनाए गए नियमों द्वारा अपेक्षित अपने निवाचन व्ययों का काई भी एवा दाखिल करते में असफल रहे हैं,

और, यह, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्यक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण भव्यता स्पष्टीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन प्रायोग का यह भी समाधान हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायालित नहीं है;

अत., अब, उक्त प्रथिनियम की भाग 10-क के अनुसरण में निर्वाचन प्रायोग एवंद्वारा उक्त श्री छन्नारकी इण्डिया चन्द्रपा को संसद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान वभा भव्यता विधान परिषद् के भव्यता द्वारा जाने और होने के लिए इस प्रावेश की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कानूनीति के लिए निरहित घोषित करता है।

[म० मंसूर-वि० स०/214/72]

दी. नागसुब्रमण्यन, सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

ORDER

New Delhi, the 9th August, 1974

S.O. 2265.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Chattaraki Irappa Chandrappa, C/o Krishna Electricals Stores, Opposite Post Office, Bagalkot Karnataka, a contesting candidate for the general election held in March, 1972 to the Karnataka Legislative Assembly from 214-Ballaloli (SC) constituency, has failed to lodge any account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notices, has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is further satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Chattaraki Irappa Chandrappa to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MY-LA/214/72]
V. NAGASUBRAMANIAN, Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 14 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2266.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग, परिचमी बगाल की सरकार के परामर्श से, श्री ई० कें० गुहा के स्थान पर, श्री ए० ए० वर्मा उच्चोंग आपुकूल तथा सचिव, वाणिज्य तथा उद्योग विभाग, परिचमी बंगाल सरकार को परिषदी बंगाल राज्य के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन प्राक्षिपर के रूप में उनके कायंभार संभालने की तारीख से एनदब्ल्यू नामनिवेशित करता है।

[सं० 154 प०बं०/74]

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1974

S.O. 2266.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of West Bengal, hereby nominates Shri S.S. Varma, Industries Commissioner and Secretary, Commerce and Industries Department, Government of West Bengal, as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of West Bengal vice Shri D.K. Guha, with effect from the date he takes charge of the office.

[No. 154/WB/74.]

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2267.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1950 (1950 का 43) की धारा 13क की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, भारत निर्वाचन आयोग, मेघालय, सरकार के परामर्श से, श्री ई० रामकृष्णन, सचिव, मेघालय सरकार, निर्वाचन विभाग को 14 अगस्त, 1974 से अगले आयोगों तक श्री आर० नटराजन के स्थान पर, मेघालय राज्य के लिए मुख्य निर्वाचन प्राक्षिपर के रूप में एनदब्ल्यू नामनिवेशित करता है।

[सं० 154/मेघा०/74]
श्री० ए० ए० भारद्वाज, सचिव

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1974

S.O. 2267.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission of India, in consultation with the Government of Meghalaya, hereby nominates Shri V. Ramakrishnan, Secretary to the Government of Meghalaya, Elections Department, as Chief Electoral Officer for the State of Meghalaya, with effect from the 14th August, 1974 and until further order vice Shri R. Natarajan.

[No. 154/MEG/74]
B. N. BHARDWAJ, Secy.

आवेदन

नई दिल्ली, 19 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2268.—यतः, निर्वाचन आयोग का समाधान हो गया है कि मार्च, 1972 में हुए बिहार विधान सभा के लिए माधारण निर्वाचन के लिए 88-मनीगढ़ी निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र से चुनाव लड़ने वाले उम्मीदवार श्री देव नारायण गुप्ता, प्राम ब्रह्मपुर सकरी, स्टेशन चौक, सकरी, जिला दरबंगा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रधिनियम, 1951 तथा नदीधीन बनारा, राय, नियमों द्वारा अप्रैलित प्रपत्रे निर्वाचन व्ययों का कोई भी लेखा शास्त्रिय करने में असफल रहे हैं;

और, यतः, उक्त उम्मीदवार ने, उसे सम्मक सूचना दिये जाने पर भी, अपनी इस असफलता के लिए कोई कारण अवश्य व्याप्तीकरण नहीं दिया है, और निर्वाचन आयोग का यह भी समाप्त हो गया है कि उसके पास इस असफलता के लिए कोई पर्याप्त कारण या न्यायालिक नहीं है;

यतः अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 10-क के अनुपर्य में निर्वाचन आयोग एनदब्ल्यू उक्त श्री देव नारायण गुप्ता को समद के किसी भी सदन के या किसी राज्य की विधान-सभा अवश्य विधान परिषद् के मदस्य चुने जाने और होने के लिए इस अदिग की तारीख से तीन वर्ष की कालावधि के लिए निरहित पोषित करता है।

[सं० बिहार वि० सं०/88/72(87)]

ए० ए० सेन, सचिव

ORDER

New Delhi, the 19th August, 1974

S. O. 2268.—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Dev Narain Gupta, Village Brahmpur Sakari, Station Chauk, Sakari, District Darbhanga who was a contesting candidate for election to the Bihar Legislative Assembly from 88-Manigachhi constituency held in March 1972 has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate even after the due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure and the Election Commission is satisfied that he has no good reason or justification for such failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Dev Narain Gupta to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No.BR-LA/88/72(87)]

A. N. SEN, Secy.

विधि, न्याय और कार्य मंत्रालय

(विधायी विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2269—केन्द्रीय सरकार, ब्रह्मपुर प्रधिनियम, 1954 (1954 का 29), की धारा 8 ए की उप-धारा (1) द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय ब्रह्मपुर परिषद् नियम, 1965 में आगे और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाती है, अधीतः—

- (1) इन नियमों का नाम केन्द्रीय ब्रह्मपुर (संशोधन) नियम, 1974 है।

(2) ये गजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख को प्रवृत्त होगे।

2 केन्द्रीय बक्फ परिषद् नियम, 1965 के, (जो इसमें इसके पश्चात् उक्त नियम के रूप में निविष्ट है), नियम 2 में, अंड (6) में, "6" अक के स्थान पर "5" अक रखा जाएगा।

3 उक्त नियमों के नियम 8 में, उप-नियम (3) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात्:-

"(3) जब किसी अधिक को विशेष आमन्त्रित के रूप में परिषद् अधिकारी उम्मीद मिली या उप-मिली के किसी अधिवेशन में हाजिर रहने के लिए आमन्त्रित किया गया हो तब प्रध्यक्ष, उम्मीद प्रयोजन को जिसकी बाबत उस अधिकारी को आमन्त्रित किया गया है तथा अन्य मुसङ्ग परिषिद्धियों को ध्यान में रखते हुए, ऐसे अधिकारी को मदस्य को अनुज्ञय दर में यात्रा भना और दैनिक भत्ता मंजूर कर सकता है।"

4. उक्त नियमों के नियम 9 में, उप-नियम (3) में, उन बोनों स्थानों पर जहां "दम रुपए" शब्द आए हैं "बीस रुपए" शब्द रखे जाएं।

5. उक्त नियमों के नियम 11 में-

(i) उप-नियम (2) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित उप-नियम रखा जाएगा, प्रथात्:-

"(2)(क) निम्न श्रेणी लिपिकों के पदों और वर्ग 4 के पदों में भिन्न पदों पर नियुक्तियां अध्यक्ष करेगा।

(छ) निम्न श्रेणी लिपिकों के पदों और वर्ग 4 के पदों पर नियुक्तियां भवित्व करेगा।"

(ii) उप-नियम (2g) का स्रोत किया जाएगा।

[संख्या 8(5)/170-बक्फ]

६० बैंकटेस्करन, निवेशक

MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE & COMPANY AFFAIRS

(Legislative Department)

New Delhi, the 30th August, 1974

S.O. 2269.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 8D of the Wakf Act, 1954 (29 of 1954), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Central Wakf Council Rules, 1965, namely:—

1. (1) These rules may be called the Central Wakf Council (Amendment) Rules, 1974.

(2) They shall come into force on the date of their publication in the Official Gazette.

2. In the Central Wakf Council Rules, 1965 (hereinafter referred to as the said rules), in rule 2, in clause (vi), for the figure "6" the figure "5" shall be substituted.

3. In rule 8 of the said rules, for sub-rule (3), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"(3) Where a person has been invited as a special invitee to attend any meeting of the Council or its Committee or Sub-Committee, the Chairman may, having regard to the purpose for which such person has been invited and other relevant circumstances, grant travelling allowance and daily allowance to such person at the rate admissible to a member."

4. In rule 9 of the said rules, in sub-rule (3), for the words "ten rupees" in the two places where they occur, the words "twenty rupees" shall be substituted.

5. In rule 11 of the said rules—

(i) for sub-rule (2), the following sub-rule shall be substituted, namely:—

"(2)(a) The Chairman shall make appointments to posts other than posts of Lower Division Clerks and Class IV posts.

(b) The Secretary shall make appointments to posts of Lower Division Clerks and Class IV posts."

(ii) sub-rule (2C) shall be omitted.

[No. 8(5)/70-Wakf]

E. VENKATESWARAN, Director

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

Bombay, the 22nd August, 1974

CORRIGENDA

S.O. 2270.—In the statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department for the week ended 19th April 1974, published in part II, Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated 11th May, 1974, the following corrigendum may be noted. On page 1293 the figures 5,25,85,000 shown under the head Loans and Advances to (iii) 'Others' may be read as 5,25,15,000.

[Gen. No. 79/4-74/75]

S.O. 2271.—In the statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department for the week ended 12th April 1974, published in part II, Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated 4th May 1974 the following corrigendum may be noted. On page 1145 the figures 4,89,10,000 shown under the head Loans and Advances to (iii) 'Others' may be read as 4,89,10,000.

[Gen. No. 80/4-74/75]

S.O. 2272.—In the Statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department for the week ended 7th June 1974, published in Part II, Section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated 4th May, 1974, the following corrigendum may be noted. On page 1656 the figures 14,410,34,000 shown on the Liabilities side under the head Deposits (b)(ii) 'Scheduled State Cooperative Banks' may be read as 14,41 34,000 and the figure 12,87,92,000 on the Assets side under the head Loans and Advances to (a)(ii) 'State Cooperative Banks' may be read as 12,87,93,000.

[Gen. No. 78/4-74/75]

Bombay, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2273.—In the statement of Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department for the week ended 21st June 1974, published in part II, section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated 13th July, 1974, the following corrigendum may be noted. On page 1741 the figures, Rs. 175,05,61,000 shown under the head 'Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank' may be read as Rs. 176,05,61,000.

[Gen. No. 84/4-74/75]

(Sd./-) Illegible.

p. Chief Accountant.

वित्त मंत्रालय,

(बैंकिंग विभाग)

रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया

नई दिल्ली, 24 प्रगस्त, 1974

का० घा० 2274.—रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया अधिनियम, 1934 के अनुसरण में प्रगत 1974 की 16 नारीख को समाप्त हुआ सप्ताह के लिए लेखा

राष्ट्रीय विभाग

देयताएँ	रुपये	रुपये	प्राप्तियाँ	रुपये	रुपये
बैंकिंग विभाग में रखे हुए नोट	38,28,97,000		सोने का सिक्का और चुम्बियन		
			(क) भारत में रखा हुआ	182,53,05,000	
संचालन में नोट	6195,52,41,000		(ख) भारत के बाहर रखा हुआ		
			विदेशी प्रतिशूलियाँ	146,73,97,000	
			जोड़		329,27,02,000
जारी किए गए कुल नोट	6233,81,38,000	रुपये का सिक्का			12,88,21,000
		भारत सरकार की रुपया प्रति-			
		शूलियाँ			5891,66,15,000
		देशी वित्तिय विल और दूसरे			
		वाणिज्य पत्र			
कुल देयताएँ	6233,81,38,000	कुल आस्थियाँ			6233,81,38,000

[म०फ० 10(1)/74-वी०घो० I]

नारीख 21 प्रगस्त, 1974

प्रा० जगद्वाधन, गवर्नर

16 प्रगस्त 1974 को रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया के बैंकिंग विभाग के कार्यकालप का विवरण

देयताएँ	रुपये	प्राप्तियाँ	रुपये
चुक्ता पूँजी	5,00,00,000	नोट	38,28,97,000
आरक्षित निधि	150,00,00,000	रुपये का सिक्का	4,18,000
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि	284,00,00,000	छोटा सिक्का	3,25,000
		खरीद और भुनाएँ गये विल	
राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरीकरन) निधि	95,00,00,000	(क) देशी	212,40,36,000
		(ख) विदेशी	
राष्ट्रीय औद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि	265,00,00,000	(ग) सरकारी खजाना विल	379,58,38,000
		विदेशी में रखा हुआ बकाया*	521,04,48,000
जमा राशियाँ		निवेश**	304,88,62,000
(क) सरकारी		ऋण और अग्रिम	
(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार	71,12,14,000	(i) केन्द्रीय सरकार को	
(ii) राज्य सरकार	12,69,22,000	(ii) राज्य सरकारों को	109,01,76,000
(ख) बैंक		ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंक	585,98,31,000	(i) अनुसूचित वाणिज्य बैंकों को +	176,43,73,000
(ii) अनुसूचित राज्य सहकारी बैंक	16,36,52,000	(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को +	192,28,74,000
(iii) और अनुसूचित राज्य महकारी बैंक	1,68,31,000	(iii) दूसरों को	28,70,90,000
(iv) अन्य बैंक	65,59,000	राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से ऋण,	
		अग्रिम और निवेश:—	
		(क) ऋण और अग्रिम:—	
		(i) राज्य सरकारों को	67,86,95,000
		(ii) राज्य सहकारी बैंकों को	15,08,39,000
		(iii) केन्द्रीय भूमिक्षण बैंकों को	
		(iv) कृषि पुनर्वित्त निगम को	64,00,00,000

देयताएँ	रुपये	प्राप्तिथा	रुपये
(ग) प्रन्थ	360,13,44,000	(ख) केन्द्रीय भूमिकालीन बैंकों के डिवेचरों में निवेश राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरकरण) निधि से ऋण और प्रधिम	11,12,81,000
देय विन	95,17,48,000	राज्य महकारों बैंकों को ऋण और प्रधिम राष्ट्रीय प्रौद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि में ऋण, प्रधिम और निवेश	49,50,36,000
अन्य देयताएँ	504,19,88,000	(क) विकास बैंक को ऋण और प्रधिम (ख) विकास बैंक द्वारा जारी किए गए बाज़ों/ डिवेचरों में निवेश	178,69,55,000
		प्रन्थ भास्तिया	98,29,46,000
	रुपये 2447,30,89,000		रुपये 2447,30,89,000

*तकरी, प्रावधिक जमा और अल्पकालीन प्रतिशूलिता शामिल है।

**राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय प्रौद्योगिक ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि में किये गए निवेश शामिल नहीं है।

(c) राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और प्रधिम शामिल नहीं है, परन्तु राज्य महकारों को दिये गए प्रस्तावी ओवरहाउट शामिल है।

× इसर्वे बैंक आंक हिंदिया प्रधिनियम की धारा 17(4)(ग) के प्रधीन प्रत्युत्तिवालिक वाणिज्य बैंकों को मियादी बिलों पर प्रधिम दिये गये 60,69,23,000 रुपये शामिल हैं।

XX राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (दीर्घकालीन क्रियाएँ) निधि और राष्ट्रीय कृषि ऋण (स्थिरकरण) निधि से प्रदत्त ऋण और प्रधिम शामिल नहीं है।

एस० जगन्नाथन, गवर्नर

ता. 21 अगस्त, 1974

[फ० स० 10(1)/74-बी० प्र० १]

ब० ब० मीरचन्द्रानी, अवरसचिव

RESERVE BANK OF INDIA

S. O. 2274.—An Account pursuant to the RESERVE BANK OF INDIA ACT, 1934, for the week ended the 16th day of August, 1974
New Delhi, the 24th August, 1974
ISSUE DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department	38,28,97,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation	6195,52,41,000		(a) Held in India	182,53,05,000	
Total Notes issued	6233,81,38,000		(b) Held outside India	146,73,97,000	
			Foreign Securities		
			Total	329,27,02,000	
			Rupee Coin	12,88,21,000	
			Government of India Rupee Securities	5891,66,15,000	
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other Commercial paper		
Total Liabilities	6233,81,38,000		Total Assets		6233,81,38,000

[No. F 1007/74 B O I]
S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

Dated the 21st day of August 1974

Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department as on the 16th August, 1974

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital Paid up	5,00,00,000	Notes	38,28,97,000
		Rupee Coin	4,18,000
Reserve Fund	150,00,00,000	Small Coin	3,25,000
		Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
National Agricultural Credit		(a) Internal	212,40,36,000
(Long Term Operations) Fund	284,00,00,000	(b) External	..
		(c) Government Treasury Bills	379,58,38,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	95,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	521,04,48,000
		Investments**	304,88,62,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Opeations) Fund	265,00,00,000	(i) Central Government @	..
		(ii) State Governments @	109,01,76,000
Deposits :—		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	176,43,73,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	192,28,74,000
		(iii) Others	28,70,90,000
(a) Government		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
	(i) Central Government	71,12,14,000	
	(ii) State Governments	12,69,22,000	
		(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
(b) Banks		(i) State Governments	67,86,93,000
	(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks	585,98,31,000	
	(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	16,36,52,000	
	(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks	1,68,31,000	
	(iv) Other Banks	65,59,000	
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks	15,08,39,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks	..
		(iv) Agricultural Refinance Corporation	64,00,00,000
		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage	
		Bank Debentures	11,12,81,000
(c) Others	360,43,44,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	
Bills Payable	95,17,48,000		
Other Liabilities	504,19,88,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks	49,50,36,000
		Loans , Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	
		(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank	178,69,53,000
		(b) Investment in Bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank	..
		Other Assets	98,29,46,000
Rupees	2447,30,89,000	Rupees	2447,30,89,000

*Includes Cash, Fixed Deposits and Short-term Securities.

**Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

†Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 60,69,23,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

Dated the 21st day of August, 1974

[No. F. 10(1)/74-BO. I.]

S. JAGANNATHAN, Governor

C.W. MIRCHANDANI, Under Secy.

केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क

CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE

चंडीगढ़ 22 दिसम्बर, 1973

Chandigarh, the 22nd, December, 1973

(सीमांश्लवा)

(Customs)

का० आ० 2275.—सीमा शुल्क प्रधिनियम 1962 (1962 का 52) की धारा 2 की उपधारा 34 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए तथा ऐसी अधिसूचनाओं और आपात अधिसूचनाओं पर प्रतिकृति प्रभाव डाले जिन्होंने कि सीमा शुल्क समाहर्ता, दिल्ली द्वारा उम समय आगे की गई थी जब कि अंतमान केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता कार्यालय, चंडीगढ़ में समाक्षिणि क्षेत्र केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता कार्यालय दिल्ली के क्षेत्र का एक हिस्सा था, और जो केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता कार्यालय चंडीगढ़ में था और नागू होती रही तथा, जी० शकरन, केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क समाहर्ता कार्यालय, चंडीगढ़ के अधिकार क्षेत्र में सीमा शुल्क समाहर्ता के रूप में नियुक्त किये जाने पर, एनड्यूआर नीचे शी गई प्रनृसूची के सम्म (1) में उल्लिखित पद के और उससे उपर के अधिकारियों को सीमा शुल्क प्रधिनियम, 1962 की उन विधियों द्वारा दी गई है, निम्नलिखित “उचित अधिकारी” के कार्यों को नियन्त करता है:—

प्रनृसूची

1

2

महायक समाहर्ता, सीमा शुल्क तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क	21, 22 (3) (भी), 30(1) (परन्तुक), 30(3), 33, 34 (परन्तुक), 41 (1) (परन्तुक), 41(3), 46 (1) (परन्तुक), 46(5), 48, 59 (3) (परन्तुक), 61 (त्रिमाही परन्तुक), 63, 64, 73, 85, 86(2), 111(0) तथा 149।
अधीक्षक सीमा शुल्क तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क	17 (4), 18, 19, (परन्तुक) भी, 22(3)(ए), 27(3), 30(1) (मुख्य), 30(1) (परन्तुक) (ए), 31, 32, 39, 41(1) (मुख्य), 42, 45(2), 47, 51, 54, 60, 67, 68, 72, 80, 89, 113(के), 115(भी), 129(2) तथा 142।
निरीक्षक, सीमा शुल्क तथा केन्द्रीय उत्पादन शुल्क	17(1)(2) तथा (3), 34 (परन्तुक छोड़कर), 37, 38, 40, 50, 62, 77, 79, 83, 144, तथा 145।

[सी० स० VIII (मुख्यालय) 1/4/सीमा शुल्क/20 8669]
जी० शकरन, समाहर्ता।

S O 2275.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section 34 of Section 2 of the Customs Act, 1962 (52 of 1962) and without prejudice to the Notifications and Trade Notices issued by the Collector of Customs, Delhi, when the area comprising the present Central Excise Collectorate, Chandigarh, was part of the Central Excise Collectorate, Delhi and which Notifications and Trade Notices are in force and will continue to remain in force in the Central Excise Collectorate, Chandigarh, I. G. Sankaran, Collector of Central Excise, Chandigarh, having been appointed as Collector of Customs within the jurisdiction of the Chandigarh Central Excise Collectorate, hereby further assign to the Officers of and above the rank mentioned in column 1 of the Schedule below, the functions of the “Proper Officer” referred to, in the various sections of the Customs Act, 1962, given in the corresponding entry in column 2 of the said schedule.

SCHEDULE

1 2

Assistant Collector of Customs and Central Excise	21, 22 (3) (b), 30(1) (Proviso), 30 (3), 33, 34 (Proviso), 41(1) (Proviso), 41(3), 46 (1) (Proviso), 46(5), 48, 59 (3) (Proviso), 61 (Second Proviso), 63, 64, 73, 85, 86(2), 111 (0) and 149.
---	--

Superintendent of Customs and Central Excise	17(4), 18, 19 (Proviso) (b), 22 (3) (a), 27(3), 30(1) (Main), 30(1) (Proviso) (a), 31, 32, 39, 41(1) (Main), 42, 45 (2), 47, 51, 54, 60, 67, 68, 72, 80, 89, 113 (k), 115 (d), 129 (2) and 142.
--	---

Inspector of Customs and Central Excise	17 (1) (2) and (3), 34 (Except the proviso), 37, 38, 40, 50, 62, 77, 79, 83, 144, and 145.
---	--

[C No.VIII (HQRS) 1/4/CUS/70/8669]

G SANKARAN, Collector.

आणिज्य मत्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त 1974

(इसायची नियन्त्रण)

का० आ० 2276.—यह इसायची बोर्ड के अध्यक्ष की मिकारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि नोक हिंत में ऐसा करना आवश्यक है,

अन. अब, इलायची (ग्रन्जापन और रजिस्ट्रीकरण) नियम, 1968 के नियम 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार किसी व्यवहारी को उक्त नियमों से सलग्न प्रक्रम ‘ग’ में उपर्याप्त शर्तों के पैरा 1 के उन उपबन्धों से, जो ऐसी सपदा से, जो रजिस्ट्रीकृत नहीं हुई है, इलायची के कार्य के प्रतियोगी करने से तथा उक्त सपदा से उसके द्वारा कार्य की गई इलायची के परिमाण की बाबत ऐसे व्यवहारी द्वारा रखे जाने के लिए अपेक्षित रजिस्टर में सपदा की रजिस्टर संश्या दर्शित करने से सबधित है, 1 मिसाल्वर, 1974 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एनड्यूआर इस शर्त के प्रतीन छूट देती है कि ऐसी सपदा के प्लाटर ने अपनी संपदा के रजिस्ट्रीकरण के लिए समय पर आवेदन किया है।

[फा० स० 32 (20) 74-प्लाट (भी)]

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

(Cardamom control)

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2276.—Whereas, on the recommendation of the Chairman, of the Cardamom Board, the Central Government is satisfied that it is necessary so to do in the public interest;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 11 of the Cardamom (Licensing and Registration) Rules, 1968, the Central Government hereby exempts for a period of one year with effect from the 1st September, 1974, a dealer from so much of the provisions of paragraph 1 of the conditions set out in Form 'C' appended to the said rules, as relate to prohibiting the purchase of cardamom from an estate which has not been registered and to showing the register number of the estate in the register required to be maintained by such dealer in respect of the quantity of cardamom purchased by him from the said estate subject to the condition that the planter of such estate has applied for registration of his estate in time.

[F. No. 32/20/74-Plant (B)]

का० आ० 2277—यतः इलायची शोई के अध्यक्ष की मिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि लोक हित में ऐसा करना आवश्यक है।

अतः यद्युपि, इलायची (भनुजापन और रजिस्ट्रीकरण) नियम, 1964 के नियम 11 द्वारा प्रबन्ध शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रत्येक नीतामकर्ता को उन नियमों से सम्बन्ध प्रस्तु 'ब' में उपबंधित शर्तों के पैरा 4 के उपपैरा (क) के उन उपबंधों से जो अरजिस्ट्रीकूण सपवा की दणा में ऐसे नीतामकर्ता द्वारा रखे जाने के लिए अपेक्षित रजिस्टर में प्लॉटर की सपवा की रजिस्टर संघर्ष वर्धित करने से संबंधित है; 1 मितम्बर, 1974 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए एन्डव्हारा इस शर्त के अधीन गूड रेसी है कि नीतामकर्ता का समाधान हो गया है कि प्लॉटर ने अपनी संपत्ति के रजिस्ट्रीकरण के लिए ममत्य पर आवेदन किया है। |

[का०म० 32(20)/74 प्लॉट (बी)]

S.O. 2277.—Whereas, on the recommendation of the Chairman of the Cardamom Board, the Central Government is satisfied that it is necessary so to do in the public interest;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 11 of the Cardamom (Licensing and Registration) Rules, 1968, the Central Government hereby exempts for a period of one year with effect from the 1st September, 1974, every auctioneer from so much of the provisions of sub-paragraph (a) of paragraph 4 of the conditions set out in Form 'B' appended to the said Rules, as relate to showing the register number of the estate of the planter, in the register required to be maintained by such auctioneer, if such estate has not been registered, subject to the condition that the auctioneer is satisfied that such planter has applied for registration of his estate in time.

[F No. 32/20/74-Plant (B)]

का० आ० 2278.—यतः इलायची शोई के अध्यक्ष की मिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार का समाधान हो गया है कि लोक हित में ऐसा करना आवश्यक है।

यतः यद्युपि, इलायची (भनुजापन और रजिस्ट्रीकरण) नियम, 1968 के नियम 11 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार प्रत्येक दालाल को उक्त नियमों से संबन्ध प्रस्तु 'ब' में उपबंधित शर्तों के पैरा 5 के उन उपबंधों से, जो ऐसे प्लॉटरों से, जिसकी सम्पदा रजिस्ट्रीकूण नहीं की गई है, इलायची उपायन करने का प्रतिरोध करने से संबंधित

है, 1 मितम्बर, 1974 से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिये एन्डव्हारा इस शर्त के अधीन गूड रेसी है कि प्लॉटर ने अपनी सम्पदा के रजिस्ट्रीकरण के लिये समय पर आवेदन किया है।

[का०म० 32(20) 74-प्लॉट (बी)]

प्रम० महादेव प्रथा, घर मन्त्री

S.O. 2278.—Whereas, on the recommendation of the Chairman of the Cardamom Board, the Central Government is satisfied that it is necessary so to do in the public interest;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by rule 11 of the Cardamom (Licensing and Registration) Rules, 1968, the Central Government hereby exempts for a period of one year with effect from the 1st September, 1974, every broker from so much of the provisions of paragraph 5 of the conditions set out in Form 'B' appended to the said rules as relate to prohibiting the procurement of cardamom from a planter whose estate has not been registered, subject to the condition that such planter has applied for registration of his estate in time.

[32/20/74-Plant(B)]

S. MAHADEVA IYER, Under Secy.

(आनंदिक व्यापार विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2279.—केन्द्रीय सरकार केसरगंज व्यापार कंपनी निपिटेड, मेरठ द्वारा अग्रिम संविदा (विनियम) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की आरा 5 के अधीन सान्यता के पुनर्नीतीकरण के लिए किए गए आवेदन पर, वायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना व्यापार के हित में और लोक हित में भी होगा, एन्डव्हारा उक्त अधिनियम की आरा 6 द्वारा प्रवत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए उक्त कंपनी को गूड में अग्रिम संविदाओं के बारे में 10 अगस्त, 1974 से लेकर 9 अगस्त, 1975 तक (जिसमें ये दोनों बीं समितियाँ हैं) की एक वर्ष की अतिरिक्त कालावधि के लिए सान्यता प्रवान करनी है।

2. एन्डव्हारा प्रदत्त सान्यता इस शर्त के अध्यधीन है कि उक्त कंपनी ऐसे निवेशों का अनुपालन करेगी जो वायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय पर दिए जाएँ।

[का० म० 12(14)-प्राई० टी०/74]

(Department of Internal Trade)

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1974

S.O. 2279.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Kaiserganj Beopar Company Limited, Meerut, and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do hereby grants,

in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Company for a further period of one year from the 10th August, 1974 upto 9th August 1975 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in gur.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Company shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(14)—L.T/74]

का० आ० 2280 — केन्द्रीय सरकार चेम्बर आफ कार्सर्स, हापुड़ द्वारा प्रग्राम मंत्रिदा (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1952 (1952 का 74) की धारा 5 के अधीन मान्यता के पुनर्वाकरण के लिए किए गए आवेदन पर, बायदा बाजार आयोग के परामर्श से विचार करके और यह समाधान हो जाने पर कि ऐसा करना आयोग के हित में और नोक हित में भी होगा, एतद्वारा उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 6 द्वारा प्रदत्त शर्कियों का प्रयोग करते हुए उक्त चेम्बर को गुड में प्रग्राम मंत्रिदाओं के बारे में 10 अगस्त, 1974 से लेकर 9 अगस्त, 1975 तक (जिसमें ये होने विन भी मम्मिलिन हैं) की एक वर्ष की प्रतिरिक्त कार्यालय के लिए मान्यता प्रदान करती है।

2. एतद्वारा प्रदत्त मान्यता इस शर्ते के प्रध्यधीन है कि उक्त चेम्बर ऐसे निदेशों का अनुपालन करेगा जो बायदा बाजार आयोग द्वारा समय पर विए जाएँ।

[का० सं० 12(13)-आ० ई०/74]

य० एस० राणा, मयूक्त निदेशक

S.O. 2280.—The Central Government having considered in consultation with the Forward Markets Commission, the application for renewal of recognition made under Section 5 of the Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act, 1952 (74 of 1952) by the Chamber of Commerce, Hapur and being satisfied that it would be in the interest of the trade and also in the public interest so to do hereby grants, in exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the said Act, recognition to the said Chamber for a further period of one year from 10th August, 1974 upto the 9th August, 1975 (both days inclusive) in respect of forward contracts in gur.

2. The recognition hereby granted is subject to the condition that the said Chamber shall comply with such directions as may from time to time be given by the Forward Markets Commission.

[F. No. 12(13)-IT/74]

U. S. RANA, Joint Director

उपसूच्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय,

आवेदण

बंगलोर, 28 मार्च 1974

का० आ० 2281.—मर्वाड़ी जगज्योति पर्फ्यूमरी वर्क्स, 288, एस० ई० आफ, ईस्ट रोड, राजामहल गुडाहनी बागेश्वर-3 की सुरभित रसायनों, प्राकृतिक संग्रह तैन और रेजिनायड्स के आयात के लिए 3027 रु० मूल्य का एक आयात लाइसेस स० पी/एस०/1827562/सी/एक्स/एम्स/47/एक्स 35-36

66 GI/74-2

दिनांक 15-6-1973 प्रदान किया गया था। अब उहोने उपर्युक्त लाइसेस की मीमांशुलक निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल प्रतियों किसी भी मीमांशुलक प्राधिकरण में पंजीकृत कराए जिना और विल्कुल भी उपयोग किए जिना चाहे गई है और यह कि अब उपर्युक्त लाइसेस की सीमांशुलक निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि प्रतियों की आवश्यकता लाइसेस के पूर्ण मूल्य 3027 रु० के लिए है।

उपर्युक्त तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शायद गत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं गतुष्ठ हूँ कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेस की मूल सीमांशुलक निकासी और मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रतियों द्वारा गई हैं और निदेश देना है कि इनकी अनुलिपि प्रतियों आवेदक को जारी की जानी चाहिए। उपर्युक्त लाइसेस की मूल सीमांशुलक निकासी प्रति और मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति एतद्वय द्वारा रह की जाती है।

[स० आ०टी०सी/एस०एस०आ०/ए-81/ए एम-73/एन०वी०]

के० जप्रामन,

उपसूच्य नियंत्रक

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CHIEF CONTROLLER OF IMPORTS & EXPORTS

ORDER

Bangalore, the 28th March, 1974

S.O. 2281.—M/s. Sri Jagajyoti Perfumery Works, 288, M.T. Block, East Road, Rajamahal Guttagalli, Bangalore-3, were granted an import licence No. P/S/1827562/C/XX/47/X/35-36 dated 15-6-1973 for Rs. 3,027/- for the import of Aromatic Chemicals, N. C. Oils and Resinoids. They have now applied for duplicate copy of Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above Licence on the ground that the originals of the above Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the licence have been lost without having been registered with any Customs Authorities and not utilised at all and that the duplicate copies of Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes of the above licence now required is for the full value of the licence Rs. 3,027.

In support of the above contention the applicant have filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above licence have been lost and direct that a duplicate copy of Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above licence should be issued to the applicant. The original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copy of the above licence are hereby cancelled.

[No. JTC/SSI/A-81/AM-73/NP]

K. JAYARAMAN, Dy. Chief Controller.

संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात-निर्यात का कार्यालय,
(केन्द्रीय लाइसेस बोर्ड)

आवेदण

नई विल्सी, 24 जून, 1974

का० आ० 2282.—सर्वेश्वी बेलटेक इन्डस्ट्रियल्स प्रा० लि०, गुडगांव को अप्रैल-मार्च, 1973 अवधि के लिए उच्च कोडिट से वास्तविक उपभोक्ता श्रेणी के अन्तर्गत टेलीविजन मेंट के लिए कालतू पुजों के आयात के लिए 56,250 रु० का एक लाइसेस स० पी/एस०/1719815, दिनांक 22-11-72 स्वीकृत किया गया था।

उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की प्रतिलिपि सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उसकी मूल प्रति में शेष 22,900 रुपये को छोड़कर 33,350 रु. तक के लिए उसका उपयोग करने प्रौद्योगिकी की सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकारी के पास पंजीकृत कराने के बाद खो गई है।

उपर्युक्त विवरण के समर्थन में आवेदक ने आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रियाविधि हैडब्ल्यू, 1974-75 की कांडिका 320 के अन्तर्गत अप्रेक्षित एक श्रेष्ठ पत्र वाचिक लिखा है। मैं मनुष्ट हूँ कि उक्त लाइसेंस की मूल प्रति खो गई है/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गई है।

आयात नियंत्रण प्रावेश, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-55 की धारा 9 (सीरी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त अधिकारों का प्रयोग कर मैं लाइसेंस की उक्त मूल सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति को रद्द करने का आवेदन देता हूँ।

आवेदक को आयात व्यापार नियंत्रण नियम तथा क्रियाविधि हैडब्ल्यू, 1974-75 की कांडिका 320 (4) की व्यवस्था के प्रनुभार 22,900 रु. के लिए उक्त लाइसेंस की प्रतिलिपि प्रति (सीमा-शुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति) जारी की जा रही है।

[संख्या पत्र पी/बी-2 (एन)/प.० एम०-73/ए० शू० एच० 1154]

के० आर० धीर, उप मुख्य नियंत्रक
कृते संयुक्त मुख्य नियंत्रक

OFFICE OF THE JOINT CHIEF CONTROLLER OF
IMPORTS AND EXPORTS
(Central Licensing Area)
ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th June, 1974

S.O. 2282.—M/s. Beltek Electronics Pvt., Ltd., Gurgaon were granted licence no. P/S/1719815 dated 22-11-72 for Rs. 56250/- from Dutch Credit under A.U. Category for import of raw material for Television Sets for AM. 73 period.

They have applied for the issue of duplicate custom purpose copy of the said licence on the ground that the original copy thereof has been lost/misplaced having been utilised upto Rs. 33,350/- after having been registered with Bombay Customs Authority leaving a balance of Rs. 22,900/-.

The applicants have filed affidavits in support of the above statement as required under para 320 of I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules and Procedure, 1974-75. I am satisfied that the original copy of the said licence has been lost/misplaced.

In exercise of the powers conferred on me under Section 9 (CC) of Import Control Order, 1955 dated 7-12-1955, I order the cancellation of the said original custom copy of the licence.

The applicants are now being issued duplicate copy (Custom Purpose only) of the aforesaid licence for Rs. 22,900/- in accordance with the provision of para 320(4) of the I.T.C. Hand Book of Rules & Procedure, 1974-75.

[No. NP/B-2(N)/AM-73/AUHH 1154]

K. R. DHEER, Dy. Chief Controller
for Joint Chief Controller

मुख्य नियंत्रक, आयात नियंत्रण का कार्यालय

नई दिल्ली, 26 जुलाई, 1974

आदेश

का० आ० 2283.—मञ्चिक, बल्ड बाइलू लाइफ, "ईंडिया", द्वारा बम्बई नेहरूपथ हिस्टरी सोमायटी, हॉर्नबिल हाउस, शहीद भगत मिहू रोड, बम्बई-१ को य० के० से 12 जोड़े दिनेक्षीय दूरबीण यंत्रों के आयात के लिए सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या: पी/जे/3043760/एन/एम/एन/47/एच०/35-36/प्राई०एल०एस०, दिनांक 3-5-73 प्रदान किया गया था। प्रब्ल उन्होंने सीमा-शुल्क निकासी की प्रतिलिपि जारी करते के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उक्त मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट खो गया है। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा यह भी सूचना दी गई है कि उक्त सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट भारत के किमी भी सीमा-शुल्क प्राधिकरण में पंजीकृत नहीं कराया गया था।

अपने तर्फ के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथपत्र दाखिल किया है। अधोहस्ताक्षरी संसूष्ट है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या पी/जे/3043760/एन/एन/एन/47/एच०/35-36/प्राई०एल०एस०, दिनांक 3-5-1973 खो गया है और निवेदन देता है कि इस की प्रतिलिपि प्रति उनको जारी की जानी आहिए। मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट एतद्वारा रद्द किया जाता है।

[संख्या सोमायटी/107/ए० एम०-72/प्राई० एन० एम०/901]

प्रार० के० घोष, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF CONTROLLER OF
IMPORTS & EXPORTS
ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2283.—The Secretary, World Wild Life, 'India' C/O, Bombay Natural History Society, Hornbill House, Shahid Bhagat Singh Road, Bombay-1, were granted C.C.P. No.P/J/3043760/N/MN/47/H/35-36/ILS dated 3-5-73 from the U.K. for the import of 12 Pairs of Binoculars. The World Wild Life have now applied for the issue of Duplicate Customs Purposes Copy of the Customs Clearance Permit on the ground that the original customs clearance permit has been lost. It has been further reported by the licence that the said C.C.P. was not registered with any Customs Authority in India.

In support of their contention the applicant has filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the original Customs Purposes Copy of the C.C.P. No.P/J/3043760/N/MN/47/H/35-36/ILS dated 3-5-73 has been lost and directs that a duplicate Customs Purposes Copy of the C.C.P. should be issued to them. The original customs clearance permit is hereby cancelled.

[No. Society/107/AM-72/ILR/901]
R. K. GHOSH, Dy. Chief Controller

आदेश

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1974

महाराष्ट्र के राज्यपाल के राज भवनप्रबंधक, राजभवन बम्बई की प्रागवाक के आयात के लिए 2000 रु. का एक सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या: जी/जी/3039517/एव/एम/एन/51/एव/39-40, दिनांक 11-4-74 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने प्रतिलिपि सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या जी/जी/3039517, दिनांक 11-4-74 खो गया है कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट किसी भी सीमा-शुल्क कार्यालय में पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया था और उसका उपयोग नहीं किया गया था। हम नर्के के समर्थन में उन्होंने एक शपल पत्र दाखिल किया है। मैं संसूष्ट हूँ कि मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट संख्या जी/जी/3039517, दिनांक 11-4-74 खो गया है और निवेदन देता हूँ कि आवेदक को प्रतिलिपि सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट जारी किया जाना चाहिए। मूल सीमा-शुल्क निकासी परमिट रद्द किया जाता है।

[संख्या गव/2/एम०-75/नर्के/1141]

जे० शंकर, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1974

S.O. 2284.—Comptroller of the Household to the Governor of Maharashtra, Raj Bhavan, Bombay was granted a C.C.P No. G/J/3039517/N/MN/51/H/39-40 dated 11-4-74 for the import of Liquor worth Rs. 2000/- They have applied for a duplicate copy of the C.C.P on the grounds that the original C.C.P has been lost. It is further stated that the original C.C.P was not registered with any Customs House and not utilized. In support of this contention he has filed an affidavit. I am satisfied that the original C.C.P No G/J/3039517 dated 11-4-74 has been lost and direct that a duplicate C.C.P should be issued to the applicant. The original C.C.P is cancelled.

[No. Gov./2/AM-75/Ad hoc/1141]

J. SHANKAR, Dy. Chief Controller

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 21 अगस्त, 1974

का० भा० 2285.—दि प्रोजेक्टस एंड इंशॉप्मेंट्स कारपोरेशन आफ इण्डिया लि०, नई दिल्ली की 13, 24, 677 रुपये मूल्य के निम्न घनत्व पालिथिलीन मॉल्डिंग पाउडर के आयात के लिए लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/1064048 दिनांक 6-9-73 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा यह भी सूचना दी गई है कि लाइसेंस किसी भी पत्तन पर पंजीकृत नहीं किया गया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। प्रधोहस्ताक्षरी सत्याप्त है कि लाइसेंस सं० जी० टी०/1064048 दिनांक 6-9-73 की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निवेदण देती है कि इसकी अनुलिपि प्रति आवेदकों को जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति एकद्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस सं० जी० टी०/1064048 दिनांक 6-9-73 की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[फा स०एस० टी० सी० मिस्क-535/73-74/आर० एम० सी०/1609]

कु० एस० के० उस्मानी,
उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक,
कृत संयुक्त भूष्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 24th August, 1974

S.O. 2285.—The Projects & Equipments Corporation of India Ltd., New Delhi were granted licence No. G/T/1064048 dated 6-9-73 for the import of Low Density Polyethylene Moulding Powder to the value of Rs. 1324,677. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Exchange copy of the above licence on the ground that the Original Exchange copy of the above licence has been destroyed in the firm which broke out in Central Bank Building Calcutta. It has been further reported by the licensees that the licence has not been registered with any port.

In support of their contention, the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the Exchange Control of Licence No. G/T/1064048 dated 6-9-73 has been lost and direct that Duplicate Exchange copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Exchange copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

The Duplicate Exchange copy of the licence No. G/T/1064048 dated 6-9-73 is being issued separately.

[F. No. STC/Misc-535/73-74/RMC/1609]

Miss S. K. USMANI, Dy. Chief Controller
for Chief Controller

प्रावेश

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1974

का० भा० 2286—भारत के राज्य व्यापार निगम लि०, नई दिल्ली को 75,000 रुपये मूल्य के सेलिस्ट रबड़ का सामान्य मुद्रा भेज से आयात के लिए एक लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/2500309 दिनांक 4-5-73 प्रदान किया गया था। उन्होंने उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रति जारी करने के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति उन से खो गई है। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा यह भी सूचना दी गई है कि लाइसेंस किसी भी पत्तन पर पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। प्रधोहस्ताक्षरी सत्याप्त है कि लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/2500309 दिनांक 4-5-73 की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति खो गई है और निवेदण देती है कि इसकी अनुलिपि उनको जारी की जानी चाहिए।

मूल मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति एन्द्र द्वारा रद्द की जाती है।

लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/2500309 दिनांक 4-5-73 की मुद्रा विनिमय नियंत्रण प्रति की अनुलिपि अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[संलग्न एमटीमी/रबड़-18-25/73-74/मारएमसी/1619]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2286.—The State Trading Corporation of India, Ltd., New Delhi were granted licence No. G/T/2500309 dated 4.5.73 for import of Synthetic Rubber from G.C.A. to the value of Rs. 75,000/-.

They have requested for the issue of Duplicate Exchange Copy of the above licence on the ground that the Original Exchange copy of the above licence has been lost by them. It has been further reported by the licensees that the licence has not been registered with any port.

In support of their contention, the applicant have filed an affidavit. The under signed is satisfied that the Exchange control copy of the licence No.G/T/2500309 dated 4-5-73 has been lost and direct that duplicate Exchange copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Exchange copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

The duplicate Exchange copy of the licence No. G/T/2500309 dated 4-5-73 is being issued separately.

[F. No. STC/Rubber-18-25/73-74/RMC/1619]

का० भा० 2287.—राज्य व्यापार निगम भारत लि० नई दिल्ली को सामान्य मुद्रा भेज से कम धनत्व वाले पोलिथिलीन मॉल्डिंग पाउडर के आयात के लिए 33,300 रुपए मात्र का एक लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/1064670 दिनांक 18-10-73 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि उपर्युक्त लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति उपर्योग का बिना ही उनके द्वारा खो गई है। लाइसेंसधारी द्वारा आगे यह प्रतिवेदित किया गया है कि लाइसेंस किसी भी पत्तन पर पंजीकृत नहीं करवाया गया है।

अपने तर्क के समर्थन में आवेदक ने एक शपथ पत्र दाखिल किया है। प्रधोहस्ताक्षरी सत्याप्त है कि लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/1064670 दिनांक 18-10-73 की सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति खो गई है और निवेदण देती है कि उन्हें उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए। लाइसेंस की मूल सीमाशुल्क प्रयोजन प्रति जारी की जानी चाहिए।

लाइसेंस सं० जी/टी/1064670 दिनांक 18-10-73 की अनुलिपि
सीमांशुलक प्रयोजन प्रति अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[मंड्या एमटीमी/विविध-650-678/73-74/भार एम सी 1618]

एस०क० उस्मानी, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

S.O. 2287.—The State Trading Corporation of India Ltd., Delhi were granted licence No. G/T/1064670 dated 8-10-73 for the import of Low Density Polythylene Moulding Power from G. C. A. to the value of Rs. 33300/- only. They have requested for the issue of duplicate Custom Copy of the above licence on the ground that the Original Custom copy of the above licence has been lost by them without being utilised. It has been further reported by the licensee that the licence has not been registered with any port.

In support of their contention, the applicant have filed an affidavit. The undersigned is satisfied that the Custom purposes copy of the licence No. G/T/1064670 dated 18-10-73 has been lost and direct that Duplicate Custom copy of the said licence should be issued to them. The Original Custom copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

The Duplicate Custom copy of the licence No. G/T/1064670 dated 18-10-73 is being issued separately.

[File No. STC/MISC-650-678/73-74/RMC 1618]

MISS S. K. USMANI, Dy. Chief Controller

प्रादेश

नई दिल्ली, 22 अगस्त, 1974

का० अ० 2288—मर्वंथ्री यूनाइटेड इन्वी० मर्वेसेस जमशेदपुर को 5,21,250 रु का एक आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी०/2065455/एस०/आई० बी०/47/एच/31-32 दिनांक 26-4-73 स्वीकृत किया गया था। उन्होंने लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रति (मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति माल) के लिए इस आधार पर आवेदन किया है कि विषयाधीन लाइसेंस छोड़ गया/प्रस्थानस्थ हो गया है।

2. इस तर्के के मर्मान्त में आवेदक ने प्रथम श्रेणी मजिस्ट्रेट के संभव विधिवृत्त अपथ लेते हुए एक अपथ पत्र वार्तिल किया है। मैं

तबनुमार अंतुष्ट हूँ कि मूल लाइसेंस छोड़ गया है। इसलिए यथा मंशोधित प्रायात (नियंत्रण) आवेदन, 1955 दिनांक 7-12-1955 की उपधारा 9 (मी सी) के अन्तर्गत प्रदत्त प्रधिकारों का प्रयोग कर सर्वश्री यूनाइटेड इन्वी० मर्वेसेस जमशेदपुर को जारी किए गए आयात लाइसेंस सं० पी० एस०/2065455/एस/आई० बी०/47/एच/31-32 दिनांक 26-4-73 को अनुदारा रह किया जाना है।

उक्त लाइसेंस की अनुलिपि प्रति (मुद्रा विनियम नियंत्रण प्रति माल) अलग से जारी की जा रही है।

[मंड्या 7(23)/70-71/सी जी-1]

मर्दूल यिह, उप-मुख्य नियंत्रक

ORDER

New Delhi, the 22nd August, 1974

S.O. 2288.—M/s. United Engineering Services, Jamshedpur granted import licence No. P/C/2065455/S/IB/47/H/31-32 dated 26-4-73 for Rs. 5,21,250/- They have applied for the issue of a duplicate copy of import licence (Exchange Control copy only) on the ground that the import licence in question has been lost/misplaced by them.

2. In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit duly sworn in before Magistrate first class. I am accordingly satisfied that the original licence has been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the power conferred under subclause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control Order) 1955 dated 7-12-1955 as amended, the said original Exchange Control copy of import licence No. P/C/2065455/S/IB/47/H/31-32 dated 26-4-73 issued to M/s. United Engineering Services Jamshedpur is hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate of the said licence (Exchange Control copy only) is being issued separately.

[No. 7/(23)/70-71/CG.I]

SARDUL SINGH, Dy. Chief Controller.

ग्रोषांगिक विकास, विज्ञान एवं प्रौद्योगिकी मन्त्रालय

(भारतीय मानक संस्था)

नई दिल्ली, 20 अगस्त, 1974

का० अ० 2289.—भारत के राजपत्र भाग II खण्ड 3, उपखण्ड (ii) दिनांक 21 नवम्बर, 1973 में छपी ग्रोषांगिक विकास, विज्ञान एवं प्रौद्योगिकी मन्त्रालय (भारतीय मानक संस्था) अधिमूलना सं० एम० अ० 3251 दिनांक 12 नवम्बर, 1973 को अधिक्रियन करते हुए भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि नीन फेंटी प्रेरण मोटर की प्रति इकाई मुहरांकन फीस का पुनरीक्षण कर दिया गया है। ये पुनरीक्षित मुहरांकन कीम जिनके और नीचे अनुमूली में दिए गए हैं, 1 जुलाई 1974 से लागू हो जाएगी :

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी	तस्वीरधी भारतीय मानक की संख्या और श्रेणी	इकाई	प्रति इकाई मुहरांकन फीस
1.	तीन फेंटी प्रेरण मोटर	IS 325-1970 तीन फेंटी प्रेरण मोटरों की विशिष्टि (तीन फेंटी प्रेरण)	1 कि० वा०	(1) पहली 20000 इकाईयों अथवा इसके नीचे की इकाईयों के लिए 20 पैसे प्रति इकाई; (2) अगली 40000 इकाईयों के लिए 10 पैसे प्रति इकाई; (3) 40000 से अगली इकाईयों के लिए 5 पैसे प्रति इकाई; (4) 100,000 इकाईयों से अधिक उत्पादन पर 2 पैसे प्रति इकाई।

[सं० सी० एम० डी०/13:10]

MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

Indian Standards Institution

New Delhi, the 20th August, 1974

S O. 2289.—In supersession of the Ministry of Industrial Development, Science & Technology (Indian Standards Institution) notification No. S.O. 3251 dated 12 November, 1973, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3—sub-section (ii) dated 24 November 1973, the Indian Standards Institution, hereby, notifies that the marking fee per unit for three-phase induction motors has been revised. The revised rate of marking fee, details of which are given in following Schedule, shall come into force with effect from 1 July 1974:—

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. & Title of Relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per unit
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Three-phase induction motors.	IS: 325-1970 Specification for three-phase induction motors (third revision)	1 kW	(i) 20 Paise per unit for the first 20,000 units or less; (ii) 10 Paise per unit for the next 40,000 units; (iii) 5 Paise per unit for the next 40,000 units and (iv) 2 Paise per unit for the production beyond 100,000 units.

[No. CMD/13:10]

नई दिल्ली, 21 अगस्त, 1974

सा० सा० 2290.—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन बिन्ह) विनियम 1955 के विनियम 7 के उपविनियम (3) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि विभिन्न उत्पादों को प्रति इकाई मुक्त लगाने की फीस नीचे अनुसूची में विए गए औरों के अनुसार निर्धारित की गई है। ये फीस ग्राम इकाई गई विविधों में लागू हो जाएगी।—

अनुसूची

क्रम सं०	उत्पादक/उत्पादक का वर्ग	सम्बद्ध भारतीय मानक की पद संख्या और शीर्षक	इकाई	प्रति इकाई मुक्त लगाने की फीस	लागू होने की निधि
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	फोरेमिनिकान	IS: 1110-1969 फोरेमिनिकान की विशिष्टि (द्रव्यमात्रा पुनरीक्षण)	एक मीटरी टन	₹ 1.00	16 जून, 1974
2.	फोरोक्रोमियम	IS: 1170-1967 फोरोक्रोमियम की विशिष्टि (पहला पुनरीक्षण)	एक मीटरी टन	₹ 1.00	16 जून, 1974
3.	फैज़ देने वाया प्रेसिंग के लिए इस्पात	IS: 3717-1966 फैज़ देने वाया प्रेसिंग के लिए इस्पात की विशिष्टि	एक मीटरी टन	25 पैसे	16 जनवरी, 1974
4.	साइडियम कार्बोनेट, मानोहाइड्रेट	IS: 6155-1971 साइडियम कार्बोनेट मानोहाइड्रेट की विशिष्टि	एक मीटरी टन	(1) पहली 10000 इकाईयों के लिए 20 पैसे प्रति इकाई, (2) अगली 10000 इकाईयों के लिए 10 पैसे प्रति इकाई, (3) शेष इकाईयों के लिए 5 पैसे प्रति इकाई।	16 मई, 1974

[स० सी० एम० झी० / 13 : 10]

New Delhi, the 21st August, 1974

S.O. 2290.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee(s) per unit for various products, details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed have been determined and the fee(s) shall come into force with effect from the dates shown against each:

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of Relevant Standard	Indian Unit	Marking Fee per Unit	Date of Effect
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1.	Ferrosilicon	IS:1110-1969 Specification for ferro-silicon (second revision)	One Tonne	Re. 1.00	16 Jun. 1974
2.	Ferrochromium	IS:1170-1967 Specification for ferrochromium (first revision)	One Tonne	Re. 1.00	16 Jun. 1974
3.	Steel for flanging and pressing	IS:3747-1966 Specification for steel for flanging and pressing	One Tonne	25 Paise	16 Jan. 1974
4.	Sodium carbonate, Monohydrate	IS: 6155-1971 Specification for sodium carbonate, Monohydrate	One Tonne	(i) 20 Paise per unit for the first 10,000 units; (ii) 10 Paise per unit for the next 10,000 units and (iii) 5 Paise per units for the remaining units	16 May 1974

[No.CMD/13:10]

S.O. 2291.—समय समत्र पर संगोष्ठित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिन्ह) विनियम, 1955 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक गद्या द्वारा अंग्रेजीति किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस जितें व्यावे तीव्र मनुष्यों में दिए गए हैं, संगठन द्वारा अपने नाम में परिवर्तन कर नेने के कारण 31 जनवरी, 1974 से रद्द कर दिए गए हैं:—

अनुमूल्य

क्रम सं०	लाइसेंस संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/ प्रक्रिया	तस्वीरी भारतीय मानक
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	सी एम/एल-29 1-7-1957	मैमर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, बी ई टी डी धूलन पाउडर— पंचपाली गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मूलद, बम्बई-80		IS : 564-1961
2.	सी एम/एल-31 14-9-1957	मैमर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, बी ई एच सी धूलन पाउडर— पंचपाली गाँव, मूलद, बम्बई-80		IS : 561-1962
3.	सी एम/एल-141 24-9-1959	मैमर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 20, हावड़ा झी ई टी धूलन पाउडर— रोड, सल्लिया, कलकत्ता		IS : 564-1961
4.	सी एम/एल-142 24-9-1959	"	झी एच सी धूलन पाउडर—	IS : 561-1962
5.	सी एम/एल-168 22-2-1960	"	झी एच सी जलविसर्जनीय धूलन पाउडर	IS : 562-1962
6.	सी एम/एल-217 31-8-1960	"	झी ई टी जलविसर्जनीय धूलन पाउडर—	IS : 565-1961
7.	सी एम/एल-252 26-12-1960	मैमर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, सी एच सी जलविसर्जनीय धूलन IS : 1507-1966 पंचपाली गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मूलद, पाउडर— बम्बई-80		

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8.	सी एम/एल-332 10-8-1961	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 20, हावड़ा एन्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— रोड, सलिया, कलकता		IS : 1310-1958
9.	सी एम/एल-501 23-1-1962	"	एन्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 1340-1958
10.	सी एम/एल-539 13-5-1963	"	सी श्री सी जलविसर्जनीय घूलन पाउडर—	IS : 1507-1966
11.	सी एम/एल-1404 8-3-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, पंच-पखाड़ी गाँव, बलराजेश्वर, रोड, मुलंद, बम्बई-80	मालाधियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 2567-1963
12.	सी एम/एल-1461 16-6-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, प्लाट सं० ७४, बी एच सी घूलन पाउडर— इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बाटूर, मद्रास-58		IS : 561-1962
13.	सी एम/एल-1484 1-8-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, पंच डी टी घूलन पाउडर— पखाड़ी गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मुलंद, बम्बई-80		IS : 564-1961
14.	सी एम/एल-1486 10-5-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, प्लाट सं० ७४, सी श्री सी जलविसर्जनीय घूलन इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बाटूर, मद्रास-58	पाउडर—	IS : 1507-1966
15.	सी एम/एल-1513 12-9-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, बी एच सी घूलन पाउडर— पंच पखाड़ी गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मुलंद, बम्बई-80		IS : 562-1962
16.	सी एम/एल-1521 15-9-1967	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, प्लाट सं० ७४, डी डी टी जलविसर्जनीय घूलन इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बाटूर, मद्रास-58	पाउडर—	IS : 565-1961
17.	सी एम/एल-1524 15-9-1967	"	बी एच सी जलविसर्जनीय घूलन पाउडर—	IS : 562-1962
18.	सी एम/एल-1636 15-2-1968	"	एन्ड्रिन पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 1310-1958
19.	सी एम/एल-2172 10-12-1969	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज, 20, हावड़ा रोड, बी एच सी पायसनीय तेज द्रव— सलिया, कलकता		IS : 632-1966
20.	सी एम/एल-2173 10-12-1969	"	डी डी टी पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 633-1956
21.	सी एम/एल-2295 31-13-970	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, बी एच सी पायसनीय तेज द्रव— पंचपखाड़ी गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मुलंद, बम्बई-80		IS : 632-1966
22.	सी एम/एल-2296 31-3-1970	,	डी डी टी पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 633-1956
23.	सी एम/एल-2892 31-1-1972	"	फेनीट्राधियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव—	IS : 5281-1969
24.	सी एम/एल-3210 3-9-1972	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, प्लाट सं० ७४, फेनीट्राधियोन पायसनीय तेज द्रव— इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बाटूर, मद्रास-58		IS : 5281-1969
25.	सी एम/एल-3438 21-6-1973	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, 431/4, डाइमेथोएट— पंचपखाड़ी गाँव, बलराजेश्वर रोड, मुलंद, बम्बई-80		IS : 3903-1966
26.	सी एम/एल-3439 21-6-1973	"	डाइमेथोएट—	IS : 3903-1966
27.	सी एम/एल-3440 21-6-1973	मेसर्स टाटा फाइशन इंडस्ट्रीज लि०, प्लाट सं० ८४ डाइमेथोएट— १४, इंडस्ट्रियल इस्टेट, अम्बाटूर, मद्रास-58		IS : 3903-1966

S.O. 2291.—In pursuance of Sub-regulation (4) of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulation 1953 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that licences particulars of which are given below, have been cancelled with effect from 31 January, 1974 due to change in the name of the organization.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. & Date	Name and Address of the Licensce	Article/Process go- verned by the licensee cancelled	Relevant Standard	Indian
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
1. CM/L-29 1-7-1957	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4 Panchpathadi Village, Balra-jeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	DDT DP	IS:564-1961		
2. CM/L-31 14-9-1957	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4 Panchpakhadi Village, Mul-und, Bombay-80.	BHC DP	IS:561-1962		
3. CM/L-141 24-9-1959	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 20 Howrah Road, Salkia Calcutta.	DDT DP	IS:564-1961		
4. CM/L-142 24-9-1959	-do-	BHC DP	IS:561-1962		
5. CM/L-168 22-2-1960	-do-	BHC WDP	IS:562-1962		
6. CM/L-217 31-8-1960	-do-	DDT WDP	IS:565-1961		
7. CM/L-252 26-12-1960	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4. Panchpakuadi Village, Bal-rajeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	COC WDP	IS:1507-1966		
8. CM/L-332 10-8-1961	-do-	Endrin EC	IS:1310-1958		
9. CM/L-501 23-1-1963	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 20 Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	Endrin EC	IS:1340-1958		
10. CM/L-539 13-5-1963	-do-	COC WDP	IS:1507-1966		
11. CM/L-1404 8-3-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4, Panchpakhadi Village, Bal-rajeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	Malathion EC	IS:2567-1963		
12. CM/L-1461 16-6-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, Plot No.94, Industrial Estate, Am-battur, Madras-58.	BHC DP	IS:561-1962		
13. CM/L-1484 1-8-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4, Panchpakhai, Village, Balra-jeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	DDT DP	IS:564-1961		
14. CM/L-1486 10-5-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, Plot No. 94, Industrial Estate, Am-battur, Madras-58.	COC WDP	IS:1507-1966		
15. CM/L-1513 12-9-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4, Panchpakhadi Village, Balra-jeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	BHC DP	IS:562-1962		
16. CM/L-1521 15-9-1967	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, Plot No.94, Industrial Estate, Am-battur, Madras-58.	DDT WDP	IS:565-1961		
17. CM/L-1524 15-9-1967	-do-	BHC WDP	IS:562-1962		
18. CM/L-1636 15-2-1968	-do-	Endrin EC	IS:1310-1958		
19. CM/L-2172 10-12-1969	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 20 Howrah Road, Salkia, Calcutta.	BHC EC	IS:632-1966		
20. CM/L-2173 10-12-1969	-do-	DDT EC	IS:633-1956		
21. CM/L-2295 31-3-1970	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4, Panchpakhadi Village, Bal-rajeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	BHC EC	IS:632-1966		
22. CM/L-2296 31-3-1970	-do-	DDT EC	IS:633-1956		
23. CM/L-2892 31-1-1972	-do-	Fenitrothion EC	IS:5281-1969		
24. CM/L-3210 3-9-1972	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, Plot No. 94, Industrial Estate, Am-battur, Madras-58.	Fenitrothion EC	IS: 5281-1969		
25. CM/L-3438 21-6-1973	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, 431/4, Panchpakhadi Village, Balra-jeshwar Road, Mulund, Bombay-80.	Dimethoate EC	IS:3903-1966		
26. CM/L-3439 21-6-1973	-do-	Dimethoate EC	IS:3903-1966		
27. CM/L-3440 21-4-1973	M/s. Tata Fison Industries Limited, Plot No. 94, Industrial Estate, Am-battur, Madras-58.	Dimethoate EC	IS:3903-1966		

का० आ० 2292—भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 4 के उपविनियम (1) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था की ओर से अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि जिन मानक चिह्नों के डिजाइन उनके शाब्दिक विवरणों तथा तत्स्वाधी भारतीय मानकों के शीर्षकों मेंहसति अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, वे भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा निर्धारित किए गए हैं।

भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिह्न) अधिनियम, 1962 और उसके अधीन बने नियमों के निर्मित ये मानक चिह्न उनके आगे दी गई विविधी सहित नीचे से लागू हो जाएंगे।

प्राप्ति

क्रम	मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन	उत्पाद/उत्पाद की श्रेणी तत्स्वाधी भारतीय मानक की	मानक चिह्न की डिजाइन का शाब्दिक लागू होने की विवरण
संख्या		संख्या और शीर्षक	

1. IS : 1110



फोरेमिलिकन

IS : 1110-1969 फोरेमिलि-

भारतीय मानक संस्था का मोनोग्राम

16 जून, 1974

कॉन की विशिष्टि

जिसमें 'ISI' शब्द होने हैं स्तम्भ

(द्वारा पुनरीक्षण)

(2) में विकार गई शैली और

अनुपात में तैयार किया गया है और जैसा डिजाइन में दिया गया है उस मोनोग्राम में ऊपर की ओर भारतीय मानक की पद-संख्या दी गई है।

2. IS : 1170



फोरेक्रोमियम

IS : 1170-1967 फोरेक्रो-

16 जून, 1974

मियम की विशिष्टि

(पहला पुनरीक्षण)

3. IS : 3747



फैज देने तथा प्रेसिंग IS : 3747-1966 फैज देने

,,

16 जनवरी, 1974

के लिए इस्पात

तथा प्रेसिंग के लिए इस्पात

की विशिष्टि

4. IS : 6155



सोडियम कार्बोनेट, IS : 6155-1971 सोडियम

,,

16 मई, 1974

मोनोहाइड्रेट

कार्बोनेट, मोनोहाइड्रेट की

विशिष्टि

[स० सीएमझ/13 : 9]

S.O. 2292.—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955 the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark(s), design(s) of which together with the verbal description of the design(s) and the title(s) of the relevant Indian Standard(s) are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been specified.

Those Standard Mark(s) for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the Rules and Regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from the dates shown against each.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Design of the Standard Mark	Product/Class of Product	No. and Title of the Relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the Design of the Standard Mark	Date of Effect
1. IS : 1110		Ferrosilicon	IS : 1110—1969 Specification for ferrosilicon (second revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	16 June, 1974
2. IS : 1170		Ferrochromium	IS : 1170—1967 Specification for ferrochromium (first revision)	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	16 June, 1974
3. IS : 3747		Steel for flanging and pressing	IS : 3747—1966 Specification for steel for flanging and pressing	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	16 January, 1974
4. IS : 6155		Sodium carbonate, monohydrate	IS : 6155—1971 Specification for sodium carbonate, monohydrate	The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters 'ISI', drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in Col. (2); the number of the Indian Standard being superscribed on the top side of the monogram as indicated in the design.	16 May 1974

[No. CMD/13/9]

नई विली, 23 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2293.—समयसमय पर संशोधित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रमाणन चिन्ह) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 14 के उपविनियम (4) के अनुमार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा प्रथिसूचित किया जाना है कि लाइसेंस संस्था सी.एम./एल-1559 जिसके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, प्रपते उत्पाद पर भा० मा० संस्था प्रमाणन योजना के अनुमार मुद्र न लगाने के कारण 1 मई, 1974 से रद्द कर दिया गया है।

अनुसूची

क्रम लाइसेंस की संख्या
संख्या और तिथि

लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता

रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन वस्तु/
प्रक्रिया

तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक

1. सी.एम./एल-1559, वि.फटिलाइजर्स एण्ड कैमिकल्स ट्रावनकोर लि०, अमोनियम क्लोराइड शुद्ध मेड, टाइप 1, IS : 1113-1965 अमोनियम डाक्षर उथोगमेडल, अल्वाय (केरल) (बैटरियों तथा शुष्क सैलो के लिए) क्लोराइड, नक्नीकी तथा शुद्ध मेड की विशिष्टि (पुनरीक्षित)

[सं. सी.एम. डी/55: 1559]

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1974

S. O. 2293.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-1559 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 1-5-1974 for not covering their product under the Indian standard.

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name & Address of the Licensee	Article/Process Governed by the Licensees Cancelled	Relevant Indian Standard
1.	CM/L-1559, 14-11-1967	The Fertilizers and Chemicals Travancore Ltd., P.O. Udyog Mandal, Alwaye (Kerala).	Amonium Chloride Pure Grade, Type 1, (For Batteries and Dry Cells)	IS : 1113-1965 Specification for Amonium Chloride, Technical and Pure (Revised). [No. CMD/55 : 1559]

नई दिल्ली, 26 अगस्त, 1974

का० प्रा० 2294.—समय-समय पर संयोगित भारतीय मानक संस्था (प्रभाणन चिह्न) विनियम, 1955 के विनियम 14 के उप-विनियम (4) के अनुसार भारतीय मानक संस्था द्वारा अधिसूचित किया जाता है कि लाइसेंस संख्या सी एम/एल-903 और 3066 जिनके ब्यौरे नीचे अनुसूची में दिए गए हैं, फर्म द्वारा अपना नाम बदल देने के कारण 1 जून, 1974 से रद्द कर दिए गए हैं।

अनुसूची

क्रम संख्या	लाइसेंस की संख्या और तिथि	लाइसेंसधारी का नाम और पता	रद्द किए गए लाइसेंस के अधीन बस्तु/प्रक्रिया	तत्संबंधी भारतीय मानक
1.	सी एम/एल-903, 21-11-1964	मैमर्स गगलभाई जूट मिल्स (मफलाल गगन- (1) भारतीय हैसियन-नमी प्रादि के लिए भाई एण्ड कॉ प्रा० लि० का प्रभाग) 38, चौरांगी रोड, कलकत्ता-16	16 प्रतिशत से अधिक भवप्राप्ति की सर्वदा पर, 305 ग्राम और 229 ग्राम प्रति बर्ग मीटर— (2) हैसियन बोरे	IS : 2818 (भाग 1) -- 1971 भारतीय हैसियन की विशिष्ट (पहला पुनरीक्षण) IS : 3790-1966 हैसियन बोरों की विशिष्टि
2.	सी एम/एल-3660 9-1-1974	"	ए-ट्रिवल पटसन बोरे	IS : 1943-1964 ए-ट्रिवल पटसन बोरों की विशिष्टि (पुनरीक्षण) [मं० सी एम डी/55:903(टी डी)] ए० कॉ० गुप्ता, उप-महानिदेशक

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2294.—In pursuance of sub-regulation (4) of regulation 14 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations 1955 as amended from time to time, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that Licence No. CM/L-903 & 3066 particulars of which are given below has been cancelled with effect from 1 June 1974 due to the change in the name of the firm.

SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Name & Address of the licensee	Article/Process Governed by the Licensees Cancelled	Relevant Indian Standard
1.	CM/L-903 20-11-1964	M/s. Gaglabhai Jute Mills, (Division : Mafatlal Gaglabhai & Co. Pvt. Ltd.), 38, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16	(i) Indian Hessian 305 and 229 g/m ² at 16 per cent Contract Regain (ii) Hessian Bags	IS : 2818 (Part-1) -1971 Specification for Indian Hessian (first revision) IS : 3790-1966 Specification for Hessian Bags. IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-Twill Jute Bags (Revised)
2.	CM/L-3660 9-1-1974	-do-	A-Twill Jute Bags	[No. CMD/55 : 903(TD)] A. K. Gupta, Deputy Director General

भारी उद्योग मंत्रालय
प्रावेश

नई विली, 26 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2295.—उद्योग (विकास तथा विनियमन) प्रधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 65) की धारा 6 के द्वारा प्रवस्त भवित्वों का प्रयोग करते हुए एवम् विकास परिषद (कार्यपादिति) नियम, 1952 के नियम 2, 4 और 5 के साथ पढ़ते हुए केंद्रीय मरकार एनद्वारा मे० टेक्समैको लिमिटेड, कलकत्ता के श्री आर० सी० माहेश्वरी को 19-4-1976 तक के लिए वस्त्र मणीनों के नियमण भारतीय उत्पादनरत अनुसूचित उद्योगों के लिए भारत सरकार के भारी उद्योग मंत्रालय के आदेश का०आ०, 1134 दिनोंक 20-4-1974 द्वारा स्थापित वस्त्र मणीन उद्योग की विकास परिषद का सदस्य नामित करती है और निदेश देती है कि उक्त भारेश में नियमिति को जोड़ा जायेगा, अर्थात् :—

28. श्री आर० सी० माहेश्वरी,
मे० टेक्समैको लिमिटेड,
'इलाको हाउस'
1 और 3 ब्रॉर्ने रोड,
कलकत्ता-1

[सं० 2-2/71-एच एम 1]
एम० कन्नन, प्रबर सक्षिय

MINISTRY OF HEAVY INDUSTRY

ORDER

New Delhi, the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2295.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 6 of the Industries (Development & Regulation) Act, 1951 (65 of 1951) read with Rules 2, 4 and 5 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules 1952, the Central Government hereby nominates till 19-4-1976, Shri R. C. Maheshwari of M/s. Texmaco Ltd., Calcutta to be a member of the Development Council for Textile Machinery Industry established by the order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Heavy Industry S.O. 1134, dated 20-4-74 for the scheduled industries engaged in the manufacture or production of Textile Machinery and directs that the following addition shall be made in the said order, namely :—

28. Shri R. C. Maheshwari, M/s. Texmaco Ltd., "ILACO HOUSE", 1 & 3 Brabourne Road, Calcutta-1.

[No. 2-2/71-HM-I]
S. KANNAN, Under Secy.

MINISTRY OF STEEL AND MINES

(Department of Steel)

CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 22nd August, 1974

S.O. 2296.—In the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Steel and Mines (Department of Steel) S.O. 385 dated the 21st January, 1974, published at pages 558-559 of the Gazette of India, Part-II Section 3 Sub-Section (ii) dated the 9th February, 1974 :—

(i) In column (2) against Serial No. 4, for the word "Bhaxupratappur" read "Bhanupratappur".

(ii) At the beginning of page 559 and above Serial No. 8, substitute the following in columns (1) and (2) in place of the existing entries :—

(1)	(2)
7. Estate Officer, Hindustan Premises belonging to and Steel Limited, Durgapur under the administrative control of Hindustan Steel Plant, Durgapur, District Burdwan, West Bengal, situated at Durgapur in Durgapur Police Station and Ondal Police Station of Burdwan District in West Bengal & premises belonging to Central Government situated at these places and placed under the administrative control of Hindustan Steel Limited.	

[(F.No. COY-6(82)/68)]

B. S. BHATNAGAR, Dy. Secy.

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन मंत्रालय

बड़ौदा, 23 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2297.—यह: इस संलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट और पेट्रोलियम पाइप लाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) प्रधिनियम, 1962 की धारा 6 की उपधारा (1) के प्रधीन प्रकाशित भारत मरकार की अधिसूचना द्वारा गुजरात राज्य कलोल तेल क्षेत्र में व्यधन संस्था के-92 से जी जी एम-1 तथा पेट्रोलियम के परिवहन के लिए उम्मलग्न अनुसूची में विनिर्दिष्ट भूमियों के उपयोग का अधिकार अर्जित कर दिया गया है।

श्रीर यतः तेल और प्राकृतिक गैस आयोग ने 19-6-1972 को उक्त प्रधिनियम की धारा 7 की उपधारा (1) के खण्ड (1) में विनिर्दिष्ट प्रक्रिया को पर्यंतव्य कर दिया है।

अब अतः पेट्रोलियम पाइपलाइन (भूमि में उपयोग के अधिकारों का अर्जन) नियमावली 1963 के नियम 4 के प्रधीन सक्षम प्राधिकारी उक्त तारीख को ऊपर निर्दिष्ट संकिया के पर्यंतव्यान के रूप में एतद्वारा अधिसूचित करता है।

अनुसूची

जी जी एम के-92 से जी जी एम-1 तथा पाइप लाइन की मक्किया का पर्यंतव्यान

मंत्रालय का नाम	गांव	सर्वेक्षण	भारत के राज्य सक्षिया के
पेट्रोलियम और रसायन	सरथा	पर्यंतव्यान में प्रका-	पर्यंतव्यान की
		शन की	तारीख

पेट्रोलियम और रसायन सरथा 2977 13-10-73 19-6-72

[(सं० 12016/4/74 एल तथा एल]
जैड० ए० शेख,

गुजरात के लिए प्रधिनियम के अन्तर्गत सक्षम प्राधिकारी

MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS

(Department of Petroleum)

Baroda, the 23rd, August, 1974

S.O. 2297.—WHEREAS by the notification of Government of India as shown in the schedule appended hereto and issued under sub-section (i) of section 6 of the Petroleum Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Act, 1962 the Right of User has been acquired in the lands specified in the schedule appended thereto for the transport of Petroleum from drill site No. K-92 to G.G S.I in Kalol oil field in Gujarat State.

AND WHEREAS the Oil & Natural Gas Commission has terminated the operations referred to in clause (i) of sub-section (1) of section 7 of the said Act on 19-6-1972.

NOW THEREFORE under Rule 4 of the Petroleum Pipeline (Acquisition of Right of User in land) Rules 1963, the Competent Authority hereby notified the said date as the date of termination of operation referred to above

SCHEDULE

Termination of Operation of Pipeline from D.S. K-92 to G.G.S.I

Name of Ministry	Village	S.O. No.	Date of publication in the Gazette of India	Date of termination of operation
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS	SERTHA	2977	13-10-1973	19-6-1972

[No.12016/4/74-LAB & LEGIS]

Z. A. SHAIKH,
Competent Authority Under the Act for Gujarat.

पर्यटन और नागर विमानम संचालन
आडेश

नई दिल्ली, 31 अगस्त, 1974

K.A. 2298.—वायुयान नियम, 1937 के नियम 160 इवारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत मध्ये ऐसे लाइसेंस-धारियों को नियम 61 के प्रवर्तन से, जहाँ तक उसका संबंध उक्त नियमों के नियम 57, 58 तथा 60 से है, छूट देती है जिन के पास बिटेन तथा आस्ट्रीलिया के समीक्षित प्राधिकारियों द्वारा प्रदत्त अधिकार वैध कराय दिए गए समीक्षित विमानन संधारण इंजीनियर लाइसेंस हैं, तथा निवेश देती है कि ऐसे लाइसेंसधारी एयर इण्डिया के स्वामित्व में तथा उनके द्वारा पारिचालित निमानों की भरमत, औरहोल, संपरिवर्तन और संधारण के लिए विमान संधारण इंजीनियरों के रूप में कार्य कर सकते हैं।

2. यह आडेश सरकारी गजपत्र में प्रकाशित होने की तिथि से एक वर्ष की अवधि के लिए वैध होगा।

[फ. सं. ए वी. 11013/8/74-ए/ए. आर./1937(4)/1974]

MINISTRY OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION

ORDERS

New Delhi, the 31st August, 1974

S.O. 2298.—In exercise of the powers conferred by rule 160 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby exempts all holders of appropriate Aircraft Maintenance Engineers Licences granted or rendered valid by appropriate authorities of the United Kingdom and Australia, from the operation of rule 61 in so far as it relates to rules 57, 58 and 60 of the said Rules and directs that the holders of such licences may act as Aircraft Maintenance Engineers in connection with the repair, overhaul, modification and maintenance of aircraft owned and operated by Air-India.

2. This order shall be valid for a period of one year with effect from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

[F. No. Av. 11013/8/74-ए/AR/1937(4)/1974]

K.A. 2299.—वायुयान नियम, 1937 के नियम 3 के उपनियम (2) का अनुसरण करते हुए केन्द्रीय सरकार एतद्वारा भारत सरकार के पर्यटक और नागर विमान भवालिय की अधिसूचना संख्या का आ. 2547, दिनांक 8 सितम्बर, 1973 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् :—

उक्त अधिसूचना में

- (1) पंरा 2 में, “एक वर्ष की अवधि” शब्दों के स्थान पर “दो वर्ष की अवधि” शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे;
- (2) अनुसूची में, कालम 2 में, क्रम सं. 7 के सामने “तथा ‘C’” शब्द व अक्षर के स्थान पर “‘C’ तथा ‘F’” अक्षर व शब्द प्रतिस्थापित किए जाएंगे।

[फ. सं. ए वी. 11016/2/74-ए/ए. आर.(1937)(5)/1974]

इस एकमात्र, उप सीधी

S.O. 2299.—In pursuance of sub-rule (2) of rule 3 of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation No. S.O. 2547, dated the 8th September, 1973, namely:—

In the said notification:—

- (i) in paragraph 2, for the words “a period of one year”, the words “a period of two years” shall be substituted;
- (ii) in the Schedule, in column 2, against S. No. 7, for the word and letter “and ‘F’” the letters and word “‘F’ and ‘M’” shall be substituted.

[F. No. Av. 11016/2/74-A/A(1937)(5)/1947]

S. EKAMBARAM, Dy., Secy.

(पर्याप्त विभाग)

पाठ्य

नई दिल्ली, 17 अगस्त, 1974

कां० श्रा० 2300 -- राष्ट्रपति, केन्द्रीय भिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 9 के उप-नियम (2), नियम 12 के उप-नियम (2) के खण्ड (ख) और नियम 24 के उप-नियम (1) द्वारा प्रबल मत्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए और पर्यटन और नगर विमान सभाकालय के पर्यटन विभाग के आदेश सं० मी० 11012/2/72-टी०१००.III तारीख 6 अग्रीस, 1973 का आंशिक उपांतरण करते हुए निवेश देते हैं कि--

(1) इस आदेश की अनुसूची के भाग 1 के स्तम्भ 1 में विनिर्विष्ट माधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग II^o के पदों की वाबत, उक्त अनुसूची के भाग 1 के स्तम्भ 2 और 3 में विनिर्विष्ट प्राधिकारी, ऋग्मण: नियुक्ति प्रधिकारी और उसके स्तम्भ 4 में विनिर्विष्ट शक्तियों के संबंध में अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी होंगे; और

(2) इस आदेश की अनुसूची के क्रमांक भाग 2 और 3 के स्तरभ 1 में विनिर्दिष्ट साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग III और साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग IV के पदों की वाबन, स्तरभ 2, 3 और 5 में विनिर्दिष्ट प्राधिकारी क्रमण नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी उसके स्तरभ 4 में विनिर्दिष्ट शास्त्रियों के संबंध में अनुशासनिक प्राधिकारी और अपील प्राधिकारी होंगे;

ग्रन्थाची

भाग १ साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा वर्ग-II

पद का वर्णन	नियुक्ति प्राप्तिकारी	शक्तियों अधिरोपित करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी और ऐसी शक्तियों जिन्हें वह [केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 11 की मद संख्याओं के संबंध में] प्रधिरोपित कर सकेगा
-------------	-----------------------	---

		प्राधिकारी	शास्त्रियों
1	2	3	4
गुरुमणि शीत	तु श्रीका परियोजना	राजिव, पर्यटन और नागर विमानन मन्त्रालय	
पर्यटन विभाग			
सभी पद (राजपत्रित)		सचिव, पर्यटन और नागर विमानन सभी मन्त्रालय	
मध्ये पद (अराजपत्रित)	पर्यटन महानिवेशक	पर्यटन महानिवेशक	सभी

भाग II, माधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, वर्ग III

पद का वर्णन	नियुक्ति प्राधिकारी शास्त्रियां अधिरोपित करने के लिए सभ्य प्राधिकारी और ऐसी शास्त्रियां, जिन्हें वह [केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियंत्रण और प्रगति)] नियम, 1965 के नियम 11 की मद संस्थाओं के संबंध में अधिरोपित कर सकेगा।
-------------	---

	प्राधिकारी	शास्त्रिया	अपील प्राधिकारी	
1	2	3	4	5
गुनमर्ग शीतकृतु श्रीहा परियोजना उप-महानिवेशक	परियोजना प्रशासक एवं परेन पर्यटन परियोजना प्रशासक एवं परेन पर्यटन अप-महानिवेशक	परियोजना प्रशासक एवं परेन पर्यटन अप-महानिवेशक	मधी	पर्यटन महानिवेशक

भाग III साधारण केन्द्रीय सेवा, बगं IV	
पद का वर्णन	प्राधिकारी शास्त्रिय अधिरोपित करने के लिए सक्षम प्राधिकारी और ऐसी शास्त्रिय, जिन्हें वह [केन्द्रीय सिविल सेवा (वर्गीकरण, नियकण और अपील) नियम, 1965 के नियम 11 की मद संबंधाओं के संबंध में] अधिरोपित करने वाली

प्राधिकारी	प्राप्तिया	अधिकारी		
1	2	3	4	5
गुलमगं शीत अनु शीडा परियोजना सभी पद	परियोजना प्रशासक एवं परेन पर्यटन उच्च प्रशासनिकों	परियोजना प्रशासक एवं परेन पर्यटन उच्च प्रशासनिकों	सभी	पर्यटन महानिवेशक

[ਸੰ. ਸੀ. 11012/2/73-ਪੰ. 1]

प्रिधारी लाल गुरा, उपसचिव

Department of Tourism

ORDER

New Delhi, the 17 August, 1974

S.O. 2300.— In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 9, clause (b) of sub-rule (2) of rule 12 and sub-rule (1) of rule 24 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965 and in partial modification of the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation, Department of Tourism, Order No. C. 11012/1/72-TA. III dated the 6th April, 1973, the President hereby directs that—

(1) in respect of the posts in the General Central Service Class II, specified in column 1 of Part I of the Schedule to this order, the authorities specified in columns 2 and 3 Part I of the said Schedule shall respectively be the Appointing Authority and the Disciplinary Authority in regard to the penalties specified in column 4 thereof; and

(2) in respect of the posts in the General Central Service, Class III and the General Central Service, Class IV, specified in column 1 of Parts II and III respectively of the Schedule to this Order, the authorities specified in columns 2, 3 and 5 shall respectively be the Appointing Authority, the Disciplinary Authority and the Appellate Authority, in regard to the penalties specified in column 4 thereof.

SCHEDULE

PART I—General Central Service, Class-II

Description of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose [with reference to item numbers in Rule 11 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1965]	Authority	Penalties
1	2	3	4	
GULMARG WINTER SPORTS PROJECT DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM				
All posts (Gazetted)	Secretary, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation	Secretary, Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation	All	
All posts (Non-gazetted)	Director General of Tourism	Director General of Tourism	All	

PART II—GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICE, CLASS III

Description of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose [with reference to item numbers in Rule 11 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1965]	Authority	Penalties	Appellate Authority
1	2	3	4	5	
GULMARG WINTER SPORTS PROJECT DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM					
All posts	Project Administrator and Ex-officio Deputy Director General of Tourism	Project Administrator and Ex-officio Deputy Director General of Tourism	All	Director General of Tourism	

PART III—GENERAL CENTRAL SERVICE, CLASS IV

Description of Post	Appointing Authority	Authority competent to impose penalties and penalties which it may impose (with reference to item numbers in Rule 11 of the Central Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules 1965)	Authority	Penalties	Appellate Authority
1	2	3	4	5	
GULMARG WINTER SPORTS PROJECT DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM					
All posts	Project Administrator and ex-officio Deputy Director General of Tourism	Project Administrator and ex-officio Deputy Director General of Tourism	All	Director General of Tourism	

[No. C. 11012/2/73-Admn. I]

G. L. GUPTA, Deputy Secy.

नौवहन और परिवहन मंत्रालय
(परिवहन पक्ष)

नई दिल्ली, 22 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2301.—यतः डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) की अपेक्षा नुसार कांडला डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) स्कीम, 1969 में आगे और संशोधन करने के लिए कनिपय प्रारूप स्कीम भारत के गजपत्र-भाग 2—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii), तारीख 9 मार्च, 1974 में पृष्ठ 797 पर, भारत सरकार के श्रम मंत्रालय की अधिसूचना संख्या 701, तारीख 1 मार्च, 1974 के अन्तर्गत, निकाला गया था तथा उसमें ऐसे मध्ये व्यक्तियों से जिनका उन प्रारूप स्कीम से प्रभावित होना संभाव्य था, उम्हे गजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास के अवधान पर्यन्त आक्षेप या सुझाव मांगे गए थे;

और यतः उक्त गजपत्र सर्वमाध्यम को 9 मार्च, 1974 को उपलब्ध था,

और यतः केन्द्रीय सरकार को उक्त प्रारूप पर सर्वमाध्यम से कोई आक्षेप या सुझाव प्राप्त नहीं हुए हैं;

अतः, अब, उक्त अधिनियम की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त व्यक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार कांडला डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) स्कीम, 1969 में निम्नलिखित संशोधन करनी है, अर्थात्—

1. (1) इस स्कीम का नाम कांडला डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) संशोधन स्कीम, 1974 है।

(2) यह गजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रदूष होगी।

2. कांडला डॉक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) स्कीम, 1969 के खण्ड 35 के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित खण्ड रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्—

“35 उम बाटा में मजदूरी का दिया जाना जब कि काम पर संग्राने के पश्चात् काम उपलब्ध नहीं कराया जाता है—जब आरक्षित पूल का कोई कर्मकार काम के लिए हाजिर होता है और किसी कारण वह काम जिसके लिए वह हाजिर हुआ है, प्रारम्भ या चालू नहीं हो सकता है और उमके लिए कोई दूसरा काम नहीं पाया जाता है, तो वह उसी प्रबंध के लिए जिसमें उमका अवधान है, मनुषित महाराई भत्ता महिने दैनिक मजदूरी दर गाने का हकदार होगा; परन्तु यह नव जब कि वह पारी के गोप भाग के द्वारा उपलब्ध रहता हो और ऐसे दूसरे नियोजन स्कीफार कर देता हो जो उसे प्रशासनिक निकाय द्वारा दिये जाएं।”

[फाइल संख्या दी-17012/3/71-पी०एण्ड० डी०/ एप० डी०]

MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT

(Transport Wing)

New Delhi, the 22nd August, 1974

S.O. 2301.—Where certain draft scheme further to amend the Kandla Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme 1969 was published as required by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948) at page 797 of the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 Sub-section (ii), dated the 9th of March, 1974, under the notification of the Govt. of India in the Ministry of Labour, No. S.O. 701, dated the 1st March, 1974 inviting objections or suggestions from all persons likely to be affected hereby, till the expiry of two months from the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

And whereas the said Gazette was made available to the public on the 9th March, 1974;

And whereas no objections or suggestions have received from the public on the said draft by the Central Government;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby makes the following Scheme to amend the Kandla Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1969 namely :—

1. (1) This Scheme may be called the Kandla Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) First Amendment Scheme, 1974.

(2) It shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.

2. For clause 35 of the Kandla Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1969, the following clause shall be substituted, namely :—

“35. Payment of wages when work is not made available after engagement. When a worker in the reserve pool presents himself for work and for any reason the work for which he has attended cannot commence or proceed and no alternative work can be found for him he shall be entitled to daily wage rate inclusive of dearness allowance appropriate to the category to which he belongs subject to the condition that he continues to be available throughout the remainder of the shift and accepts such alternative employment as may be offered to him by the Administrative Body.”

[File No. V-17012/3/71-P & D)/LD]

नई दिल्ली, 27 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2302.—कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) स्कीम, 1970 में और संशोधन करने के लिए स्कीम का निम्नलिखित प्रारूप, जिसे केन्द्रीय सरकार, डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त व्यक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, बनाने की प्रस्थापना करती है, उक्त उपधारा द्वारा यथापेक्षित उन मध्ये व्यक्तियों की जानकारी के लिए, जिनका उसमें प्रभावित होना संभाव्य है, प्रकाशित किया जाता है और सूचना दी जाती है कि उक्त प्रारूप पर इस अधिसूचना के गजपत्र में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति पर या के पश्चात् विचार किया जाएगा।

उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट तारीख से पूर्व किसी व्यक्ति से प्राप्त किन्हीं आक्षेपों या सुझावों पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विचार किया जाएगा।

प्रारूप स्कीम

1. इस स्कीम का नाम कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) संशोधन स्कीम, 1974 है।

2. कलकत्ता डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियम) स्कीम, 1970 के खण्ड 3 के उपखण्ड (n) में “350 टन से कम न हो” शब्दों और मास्टों के पश्चात् “या लण पोन में उनारी गई लैंग नावें” शब्दों को जोड़ा जाएगा।

[फा सं. एम-70012/6/74-पी०एण्ड० डी०(1)/एम०डी०]

New Delhi, the 27th August, 1974

S.O. 2302.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment)

merit) Scheme, 1970 which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the period so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This scheme may be called the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1974.

2. In sub-clause (t) of clause 3 of the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1970 after the figures and word "350 tons" the words "or Lash Barges discharged from Lash Ship" shall be added.

[File No. S-70012/6/74-P&D (i)/LD]

नई दिल्ली 28 अगस्त, 1974

कांग्रेस 2303.—कालाना अर्जिस्ट्रीकून डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 में और संशोधन करने के लिए स्कीम का निम्नलिखित प्रारूप, जिसे केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 1 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शब्दियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, बनाने की पस्थापना करती है, उक्त उपधारा द्वारा यथा अंतिम उन सभी अविनियोक्ती जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किया गया है जिनका उसमें प्रभावित होने सम्भाव्य है, नथा सूचना थी जाती है कि इस अधिसूचना के गत दो वर्षों में दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति पर या उस के पश्चात् उस प्रारूप पर विवार किया जाएगा।

उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि में पूर्व किमी अविनय में जो भी आक्षेप या सुझाव प्राप्त हो सके उन पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विवार किया जाएगा।

प्रारूप स्कीम

1 इस स्कीम का नाम कालाना अर्जिस्ट्रीकून डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1974 है।

2. कालाना अर्जिस्ट्रीकून डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1968 के अन्त 20 में, "स्टार्टिकर्ण" के शास्त्र पर निम्नलिखित समटीकरण रखा जाएगा, प्रवर्त्ति —

"स्टार्टिकर्ण —हा ब्रेक में, एक 'दिन' में किसी भी विनियमी कर्मकार द्वारा विनियमन की एक या एक में प्रधिक पारी अधिवेश है।"

[मं. पम. 70012/10/73-पी.एड० दृ०/पल०दी०]

New Delhi, the 28th August, 1974

S.O. 2303.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968 which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

he information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry for a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the period so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

DRAFT SCHEME

1. This Scheme may be called the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1974.

2. In clause 20 of the Kandla Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1968 for the "Explanation", the following Explanation shall be substituted, namely :—

Explanation :—In this clause, a 'day' means one or more than one shift worked by a worker on any day."

[No. S-70012/10/73-P&D/LD]

कांग्रेस 2304.—मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1956 में और संशोधन करने के लिए स्कीम का निम्नलिखित प्रारूप, जिसे केन्द्रीय सरकार डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1948 (1948 का 9) की धारा 4 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शब्दियों का प्रयोग करने हुए बनाने की स्थापना करती है, उक्त उपधारा द्वारा यथा अंतिम उन सभी अविनियोक्ती जानकारी के लिए प्रकाशित किया जाता है। जिनका उसमें प्रभावित होना सम्भाव्य है और सूचना दी जानी है कि उक्त प्रारूप पर, इस अधिसूचना के गतवर्त में प्रकाशन की तारीख से दो मास की अवधि की समाप्ति पर या उसके पश्चात् विवार किया जाएगा।

उक्त प्रारूप की बाबत इस प्रकार विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि में पूर्व किमी अविनय में जो आक्षेप या सुझाव प्राप्त होगे उन पर केन्द्रीय सरकार द्वारा विवार किया जाएगा।

प्रारूप स्कीम

1 इस स्कीम का नाम मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) संशोधन स्कीम, 1974 है।

2 मुम्बई डाक कर्मकार (नियोजन का विनियमन) स्कीम, 1956 में अन्त 3 के मद (d) के अन्त में निम्नलिखित शब्द जोड़े जाएंगे अर्थात् —

'और उसमें ऐसी नीकारी भी सम्मिलित है जो लैम पोत से उन्मुक्त की गई है।'

[मं. पम. 11025/1/74-पी.एड० दृ०/पम. दौ०]

S.O. 2304.—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956 which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the expiry of a period of two months from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the

मिश्राई और विद्युत् मन्त्रालय

नई दिल्ली, 13 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2307.—भारतीय विद्युत प्रधिनियम, 1910 (1910 का 9) की धारा 36(क) की उपधारा 2(क) का पालन करने हुए केंद्रीय सरकार मिश्राई और विद्युत मन्त्रालय के अनियन्त्रित मन्त्रिय श्री सी० सी० पटेन को श्री प० क० ब्राप के स्वान पर केंद्रीय विज्ञान वाचं का प्रधान नियुक्त करती है।

[ग० ई० एन० २-५/(१)/७३]

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

New Delhi, the 13th August, 1974

S.O. 2307.—In pursuance of sub-section 2(a) of section 36A of the Indian Electricity Act, 1910 (9 of 1910), the Chairman of the Central Electricity Board vice Shri A. K. Additional Secretary, Ministry of Irrigation & Power as Chairman of the Central Electricity Board vice Shri A. K. Ghosh.

[No. II, II 9(1)/73]

नई दिल्ली 21 अगस्त, 1974

आवेदन

का० आ० 2308.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय विद्युत् नियम, 1956 के नियम 133 के उपनियम (2) द्वाग प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, मेसमे नेशनल मिसरल इंजिनियरिंग कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड के खेलाडियों लाह अपम्क खान निशेष ५० म०, रुपी १.६८ शाखा मे प्रतिशत, ४० के० बी००५०, ३३००/२३० वी, वितरण ट्रान्सफार्मर के उपयाग की बाबत, उक्त नियम के नियम 130 के उपवधा को उस सीमा तक शिखित करनी है कि द्वितीय कुड़तन के लिए न्यूट्रल भू-सम्पर्कित न हो।

[ग० ई० एन० २-६(१२)/७३]

New Delhi, the 24th August, 1974.

ORDER

S.O. 2308.—The Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred on them by sub-rule (2) of Rule 133 of Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, hereby relax the provision of Rule 130 of the said rules in respect of use of 40 KVA, 3300/230V, distribution transformers installed in 4.6-B. Russian made shovels at Badadila Iron Ore Mine, Deposit No. 5 of M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd., to the extent that the neutral for the secondary winding is not earthed.

[No. II, II-6(12)/73]

आवेदन

का० आ० 2309.—केंद्रीय सरकार, भारतीय विद्युत् नियम, 1956 के नियम 133 के उपनियम (2) द्वाग प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करने हुए, नियम दंती है कि उक्त नियमों के —

- (1) नियम 118(क)
- (2) नियम 118(ग)
- (3) नियम 119 (1) (क)
- (4) नियम 123 (7) और
- (5) नियम 130

के उपबन्ध, भेगस नेशनल मिसरल इंजिनियरिंग कारपोरेशन लिमिटेड की द्विनियमलै विवृत लोह अपम्क खान मे दा० ३.३ के० वी०, रुपी रुपी ६६६, टाप्प ई के० जी ४.६ वी, विद्युत् गाधिव से खेल, जेना प्रबन्धान्व के पत्र म० ई० डब्लू/८ (1)/७३/३३७७ नार्गीश २१-८-७३ के परिणामित मे दिया गया है, क प्रयोग की बाबत निम्नलिखित सीमा तक शिखित किए जा सकेंगे —

- (1) नियम 118 (क) के शिखितीकरण मे, जावेल मे, माटर जनक्ष संट के लिए सुशाहूय माटर ३.३ के० वी० पर प्रयुक्त की जा सकेंगी;
- (2) नियम 118 (ग) शिखितीकरण मे, ४० के० वी०५० ३३००/२३० वी० सहायक ट्रान्सफार्मर के फैजिज और ल्यूट्रन बिन्डु के मध्य अनियाप्त उत्कृष्टिक के भीतर १२७ बोल पद्धति का प्रकाश प्रदाय, जिस पर विशेष स्थ से विचार किया गया है, प्रयोग मे लाया जा सकेगा;
- (3) नियम 114 (1) (क) शिखितीकरण मे एक ४० के० वी०५०, ३३००/२३० वी०, तीन केज़ स्टार/स्टार ट्रान्सफार्मर अपन मह० उपमकर सहित ३.३ के० वी० उर्जा का प्रयोग करने हुए, सुशाहूय शाखा मे प्रतिष्ठापित, एक स्थान मे दसरे स्थान को जाने वाला, सुशाहूय प्रकृति का हाने के कारण अचल माध्यम नही० हो सकेगा;
- (4) नियम 123 (7) के शिखितीकरण मे, ३०० मीटर मे अनधिक लम्बाई का सर्वोत्तम केबल शाखा के साथ प्रयोग मे लायी जा सकेंगी; और
- (5) नियम 130 के शिखितीकरण मे, ४० क०वी०५० ट्रान्सफार्मर का ल्यूट्रल बिन्डु भू-सम्पर्कित नही० किया जा सकेगा, और शिखितीकरण निम्नलिखित शर्तों के शर्वान होगा —
 - (1) ३.३ के० वी० अनुगमी केबल को प्रवाय नियन्त्रित करने वाली ३.३ के० वी० परिपथ-विच्छेदक के लिए, उसमे भू-वाय होने वी० दणा मे पद्धति से प्रदाय को काटन के लिए भूभरण सरकण का पर्याप्त व्यवस्था की जाएगी।
 - (2) सर्वोत्तम केबल को ३.३ के० वी० प्रदाय के नियन्त्रित करने वाले परिपथ विच्छेदक के प्रशास्त्र रुट, यन्त्र मे प्रतिष्ठापित ३.३ के० वी० सोटर और ट्रान्सफार्मर के प्रम निर्धारण मान के अनुसार होगा।
 - (3) यन्त्र के भीतर प्रतिष्ठापित और नार, भारतीय, विद्युत् नियम 1956 के सुमित्र उपवधा विशेषतया नियम ११५-११७, १२४ और १२५ (उप-नियम १, ५, ७, ८ और ९) के अनुपालन मे होंगे।

(4) गच्चीली अनुगामी केबल विद्युत प्रदाय पद्धति और यन्त्र के साथ उचित रूप में गतिशील कनेक्टर-बोर्ड या पूर्णगता बन्द मुरशिद (समालयन वस्तुओं) द्वारा त्रुटी शोरी चालिए।

(5) शावेल और लचीनी अनुगामी केबल पर सम्पर्क सावधानी से काम किया जाएगा, और उन्हें चलाया जाएगा ताकि किसी विद्युत कुटी या प्रयोग से उनमें होने वाले खतरों नो रका जा सके। उच्च कॉल्ट परिषय जिसमें चालन सोडर सम्मिलित है, का सरोध किसी भी गमय 10 मेंग और अचाम्प एम से कम नहीं होगा।

(6) शावेल के प्रचालकों को, यन्त्रों का रखने के लिए यन्त्रों के सक्षमता और सम्पर्क सावधानी से प्रचालन के लिए, नियम तीन के अधीन परिषिक्षित और प्राधिकृत किया जायेगा।

परन्तु पूर्वोक्त शिविलीकरण ऐसे समय तक विधिमाल्य होगा जब तक उक्त यन्त्रों का आन में प्रयोग होता रहे और खान मुरक्का उत्तरांशक (विद्युत के माध्यम से केंद्रीय सरकार का उसी समय सम्पर्क सूचना दी जाएगी, जैसे श्री यन्त्र खान में बढ़ाव निकाल लिया जाता है।

[सं०६०५०८० २-८(11)/७३]

मुख्य प्रकाश जैन,

उप-निदेशक (विद्युत)

S.O. 2309.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of rule 133 of Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of—

- (1) Rule 118 (a)
- (2) Rule 118 (c)
- (3) Rule 119 (1) (a)
- (4) Rule 123 (7), and
- (5) Rule 130

of the said rules shall be relaxed in respect of the use in opencast Donimalai iron ore mine of M/s. National Mineral Development Corporation Ltd., of two 33 KV, Russian make electric shovels, bearing SL Nos. 656 and 661 type 1 KG 46B, equipped with electrical apparatus, as per the appendix of Management's letter No. EW/8 (1)/73/3377 of 24-8-73 to the extent that (1) in relaxation of rule 118 (a), the portable motor for the motor generator set in the shovels may be used at 3.3 KV, (2) in relaxation of rule 118 (c), 127 Volt system of lighting supply within the excavator obtained between phase and neutral point of 40 KVA 3300/230 V, auxiliary transformer, the same is specially considered and may be used, (3) in relaxation of rule 119 (1)(a), one 40 KVA, 3300/230V, three phase star/star transform with its associated equipment using energy at 3.3 KV may not be a fixed apparatus, as being installed on a portable shovel, moving from place to place, the same having a portable sense (4) in relaxation of rule 123(7), the flexible cable of a length not exceeding 300 metres may be used with the shovel, and (5) in relaxation of rule 130, the neutral point of 40 KVA transformer may not be earthed; and that the relaxation shall be subject to the following conditions :—

(1) The 3.3 KV circuitbreaker controlling supply to the 3.3 KV trailing cable shall be provided with efficient earth leakage protection, for disconnection of supply from the system in the event of an earth fault taking place in the same.

(2) The overcurrent trips of the circuitbreaker controlling 3.3 KV supply to the flexible cable shall be in keeping with the rating of the 3.3 KV motor and the transformer installed in the machine.

(3) The installation and wiring inside the machine shall comply with the relevant provisions of Indian Electricity Rules 1956, in particular rules 115-117, 124 and 125 (sub-rules 1, 4, 7, 8 and 9).

(4) The flexible trailing cable should be connected to the electric supply system and machine by properly constructed connector boxes or totally enclosed safe attachments.

(5) The shovels alongwith the flexible trailing cable shall be worked and handled with due care, so as to avoid danger arising out of any electrical defect or in the use. The insulation resistance of the High Voltage circuit including the driving motor shall at no time be less than 10 meg ohms.

(6) The operators of the shovels shall be trained and authorised under rule 3 for operating the machines with competency and due care to avoid danger.

Provided that the aforesaid relaxation shall be valid for such time as the said machines are in use in the mine and due information shall be given to the Central Government through the Deputy Director of Mines Safety (Electrical), as soon as the machines are taken out of the mine.

[No. EL II-6(11)/73]

S P JAIN, Dy. Director (Power)

मंत्रालय

(डाक-नार योड़)

नई दिल्ली, 30 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2310 स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक ५ मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय नार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-नार महानिदेशक ने मिलोड टेलीफोन केन्द्र से दिनांक 1-10-74 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्ठय किया है।

[सं० ५-२६/७४-पी एच बी]

MINISTRY OF COMMUNICATIONS

(P & T Board)

New Delhi the 30th August, 1974

S.O. 2310.—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960 the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 1-10-74 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Milaout Telephone Exchange, Punjab Circle.

[No. S-26/74-PHB]

का० आ० 2311.—स्थायी आदेश संख्या 627, दिनांक ५ मार्च, 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए भारतीय नार नियम, 1951 के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-नार महानिदेशक ने मुख्यमार्ग टेलीफोन केन्द्र से दिनांक 1-10-74 से प्रमाणित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निष्ठय किया है।

[सं० ५-२६/७४-पी एच बी]

पी० मी० गुप्ता, महानिदेशक

S.O. 2311—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules 1951 as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March 1960, the Director General, Posts and Telegraphs hereby specifies the 1st October 1974 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Muktsar Telephone Exchange Punjab Circle

[No. 526/74 PHB]

P C GUPTA,
Assistant Director General

अम सवालय

आदेश

नई प्रिन्टा १ जुलाई १९७४

का० आ० २३१२—प्रीतागिरि दिवाल अधिनियम १९४७ (१९५७)
का० ११) की धारा १० की उपधारा (१) ते घटक (२) द्वारा प्रदत्त
शक्तिया वा प्रयाग वरते दुग धन्दीय मध्यां भारत मध्यां के धम
मवालय के आदेश म, का० आ० १७ नाराय १८ दिसम्बर १९७३
के पंग । और उसस उपावद अनुसूचा म निम्नलिखित मणाधन कारी
है अथान —

प्राचक्षण मध्यां प्रितागिरि शादा क स्थान पर उन्नादन केन्द्र निदेशालय
प्रितागिरि क अधीन उन्नादन और विस्तार केन्द्र शब्द रखे जाएँ।

[मो. ०८०-१२०१२/१/७३/प्रा०-३(१)]

पी आर नायर अध्यक्ष मन्त्रिव

MINISTRY OF LABOUR

ORDER

New Delhi, the 4th July, 1974

S.O. 2312.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendment in para 1 of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour No. S.O. 178 dated the 19th December 1973 and in the Schedule annexed thereto namely —

For the words "Production Centres, Ettumanoor, the words 'Production and Extension Centres, under the Directorate of Production Centres, Ettumanoor' shall be substituted

[No. L 42012/21/73/LR III(1)]

New Delhi the 26th August, 1974

S.O. 2313—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Hyderabad in a petition filed under section 33A of the Act by Shri Gurrala Muthyalu, workman Ex Machine Mining Operator Godavari Khani (Andhra Pradesh) against the management of Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Hyderabad which was received by the Central Government on the 13th August, 1974

BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (CENTRAL)
AT HYDERABAD

PRESLNT

Shri T. Narasing Rao M.A. LL.B. Industrial Tribunal,
Hyderabad

MISCELLANEOUS PETITION NO. 82 OF 1973

IN

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE NO. 30 OF 1967

BETWEEN

Gurrala Muthyalu vs. Muthuiah Ex Machine Mining

Operator (Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd.) Godavari
Khani No. 5 Incline —Petitioner

AND

The Management Singareni Collieries Co. Ltd., Rama-
gundam Division, Godavari Khani, Karimnagar
District —Respondent

APPLARANCIES

Sri V. Lakshmana Rao, Advocate for Petitioner.

Sri M. Shyam Mohan, Personnel Officer Singareni
Collieries Co. Ltd., Bellampalli and Sri D. Gopala
Rao, Member of FCC&I, Hyderabad for
Respondent

WARD

In this complaint under Section 33A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (which would be hereinafter referred to as the Act) the Complainant Petitioner alleges contravention by the Management—Respondent of the provision of Section 33 of the Act and prays for his reinstatement as Machine Mining Operator with Category VI wages with effect from 22-5-1973

2 The petition allegations briefly are these —The Petitioner has been working as Machine Mining Operator in No. 5 Incline at Godavari Khani and has put in more than 12 years of service under the Respondent. While working as Machine Mining Operator he fell ill. The Medical Officer of the Company certified on 27-3-1973 that the Petitioner is unfit for work. The Petitioner underwent treatment at the Company's Dispensary situated at Godavari Khani from 27-3-1973 to 5-4-1973. It is alleged that during this period he had none to attend upon him as his mother and relatives were staying at Peddapally and that they took him to Peddapally and got him admitted in the Government Hospital at Peddapally on 6-4-1973, where he was under treatment upto 21-5-1973 for 'Atomic Dysentery'. The Medical Officer of Peddapally hospital certified that the Petitioner was fit for duty from 22-5-1973. It is however specifically averred that during the period of treatment the Management was informed of it and a letter was also handed over to the Pit authorities

On 22-5-1973 when the Petitioner went to Khani to resume duty the authorities did not permit him. He therefore made an application accompanied by a medical certificate to the Agent of Rama-gundam Division-II explaining the circumstances and also requesting him to permit him to duty. No reply is said to have been received from the Management to this letter. Therefore the Petitioner gave another letter on 27-7-1973 to which the Management replied that the Petitioner would be taken as Badhi Filler and not as Machine Mining Operator. It is also alleged that the job of Machine Mining Operator is in Category VI and is a highly skilled job whereas a Filler is a piece rated unskilled worker. On 12-7-1973 and 15-7-1973 representations are said to have been made to the Management by the Petitioner to the same effect but the Management refused to take him on duty as Operator. The Petitioner is said to be a concerned workman in ID No. 30 of 1967 pending on the file of this Tribunal in which one of the questions involved is with regard to the categorisation and modification of the wage structure recommended in respect of these operators. It is alleged that since the Management pending the dispute refused to permit the Petitioner to resume duty that action amounts to dismissal and in as much as the Management has not followed the procedure laid down under Section 33 of the Act in dismissing the workman the Management has violated the provisions of Section 33 of the Act. It is also alleged that before the Order of dismissal was passed the Petitioner was not served with any charge sheet nor the Management has filed any application before the Tribunal either seeking permission or approval of the action taken by the Management. It is also alleged that the Petitioner is not guilty of any misconduct and has not lost the lien on his appointment as Machine Mining Operator. Thus the action of the Management is said to be illegal, improper and unjust. Hence this complaint under Section 33A of the Act

3 In the counter filed by the Management it is inter-alia alleged that the Management has not contravened any pro-

visions of the Industrial Disputes Act and therefore the petition is liable to be dismissed in limine. It is admitted that the Petitioner was declared unfit for work by the Medical Officer on 27-3-1973 and that the Petitioner was treated in the Dispensary upto 5-4-1973. The Management is said to be unaware of the movements of the Petitioner after 5-4-1973 nor the Management was informed of any treatment undergone by the Petitioner-Workman at any other place. The Petitioner has not chosen to apply for extension of leave as per the procedure laid down under the Standing Orders. It is thus alleged that as the Workman stayed away beyond the period of sanctioned leave and did not report to duty within 10 days thereafter, he was informed on 22-4-1973 that he lost his lien on his appointment and therefore his services were terminated with effect from 23-4-1973. It is also averred that the Petitioner in his application dated 2-7-1973 admitted that he was unable to extend his leave due to personal difficulties. The Management by its letter dated 17-7-1973 is said to have offered the workman the post of Badli Filler and also informed him that if he fails to join within 15 days from the date of the receipt of the letter the workman would be forfeiting the offer of Badli Filler. The Vice President of the Union is said to have been informed about the details of the case. It is denied that the Petitioner is a workman concerned in I.D. No. 30 of 1967. It is also denied that there is any obligation on the Management to permit this ex-employee to duty as and when he chooses to appear. It is specifically averred that the action of the Management is not covered by the provisions of Section 33(2)(b) of the Act as the dismissal or the discharge of the workman was not for any misconduct. It is thus reiterated that there is no violation of the provisions of Section 33(2)(b). It is also alleged that since the termination was an automatic one, the employer need not obtain the permission or approval of the Tribunal in as much as there was no disciplinary proceedings taken by the employer. The case of automatic terminating on account of losing his lien on his appointment by not joining duty within certain time after the expiry of leave is said to be well settled by the ruling of the Supreme Court reported in 1967(IJ) 111, page 883. It is alleged that the Petitioner has no cause of action for laying this complaint under Section 33A of the Act as there is no contravention of Section 33 by the Management. It is thus contended that the complaint is not maintainable and that the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to adjudicate into the complaint as an Industrial Dispute.

4. In support of this complaint the Petitioner examined himself as P.W. 1. It is deposed by him that on 27-3-1973 he got himself admitted into the Company's dispensary and that the Medical Officer also certified that he was unfit for duty. He was under treatment in this dispensary till 5-4-1973. His version is that on the evening of 5-4-1973 his mother and brother-in-law came from Peddapally and they took him in order to admit him in Peddapally Hospital. At that moment his mother and brother-in-law informed his neighbour by name Somanna Nasirah that the latter should inform the Manager about this fact. It is also his version that he was under treatment at Peddapally hospital from 6-4-1973 to 21-5-1973. During this period of treatment he sent a chit to the Manager through his brother-in-law informing that he was under treatment. P.W. 2 is his brother-in-law who deposed to the fact that when P.W. 1 was under treatment at Peddapally hospital he took a chit got written by P.W. 1 and delivered at the Manager's office at Incline No. 5. He is however at a loss to name the person to whom he delivered the chit. In documentary evidence the Petitioner relied upon Exs. P1 to P4 which are the copies of his representation and the Medical Certificate issued by the Medical Officer, Peddapally and the copies of his representations dated 10-7-1973 and 15-7-1973 addressed to the General Manager. In rebuttal two witnesses were examined in oral evidence and Exs. R1 to R10 are relied by way of documentary evidence. R.W. 2 is the Manager of this incline till 29-4-1973 whereafter he was transferred. It is his evidence that on 27-3-1973 itself as per Ex. R8 he received a letter from the Medical Officer about the unsuitability of the Petitioner. On 19-4-1973 he received a letter from the Medical Officer as per Ex. R9 to the effect that the Petitioner was not attending the hospital from 5-4-1973. It is denied by him that either any relative of the Petitioner informed him about the Petitioner going to Peddapally Hospital for treatment nor any information was received from the petitioner that he was under going treatment at Pedda-

pally hospital. It is admitted by him that even on 27-3-1973 he has not received any application for leave from the Petitioner and that there is no specific order sanctioning leave to the Petitioner. It is his version that on 22-4-1973 he issued a letter intimating the automatic termination under Standing Order 11(c) in view of the report Ex. R9 from the hospital. It is also deposed by him that whenever they receive a medical report or an unfit certificate from the Medical Officer, the workmen will be treated as on sick leave, and it is not necessary for the workmen to make an application for leave. R.W. 1 is the Manager of this Khami from May, 1973. He would speak to the various representations received in the office from the workmen. According to him Standing Order 11(c) covers sick leave with pay or without pay privilege leave with pay or ordinary leave on loss of pay or casual leave on loss of pay. It is however admitted by R.W. 2 that in the wage register the sick leave of the Petitioner is marked from 26-3-1973 to 5-4-1973. It is however explained by him that this entry is made only for the purposes of payment of wages ending with the month of March 1973.

5. Though in the counter it is contended that the Petitioner is not a workman concerned in I.D. No. 30 of 1967, that plea is devoid of substance. Even on the date of this complaint I.D. No. 30 of 1967 is pending on the file of this Tribunal in which one of the issues relate to the modification of wages pertaining to the Machine Mining Operators as recommended by the Wage Board. The Management also does not seriously controvert this position that the petitioner is a workman concerned in the main industrial dispute. The question therefore is whether there was any contravention of the provisions of Section 33 which would enable the workman to file this complaint under Section 33A of the Act.

6. According to the Management the workman was sanctioned sick leave and he stayed away thereafter till 22nd April, 1973 and therefore he lost his lien on his appointment and thus incurred automatic termination of his services. Thus the Management would put it that there was no dismissal or discharge of a workman for any misconduct in which event alone there is an obligation on the Management to hold a domestic enquiry as per the provisions of the Standing Orders. Thus it is contended that as the dismissal or discharge was not for any misconduct or even the misconduct of absenteeism, the provisions of Section 33(2)(b) of the Act are not at all attracted and therefore there was no need to hold a domestic enquiry or to obtain the approval of the Tribunal for the dismissal of the workman. In order to decide this question whether there was any contravention of Section 33 by the Management it is necessary to read the Standing Orders to find out whether there was a loss of lien on the appointment. The contention on behalf of the workman-petitioner was that the workman did not apply for any sick leave and even assuming that he stayed away or did not undergo further treatment at the Company's dispensary from 5-4-1973 onwards, it is at best a case of absenteeism in which event the Management was bound to hold a domestic enquiry as the said absenteeism constitutes a misconduct. Standing Order 11(c) reads as follows:—

"If the employee remains absent beyond the period of leave originally granted or subsequently extended he shall lose his lien on his appointment unless:

- (i) he returns within 10 days of the expiry of the leave and
- (ii) gives an explanation to the satisfaction of the Manager of his inability to return before the expiry of leave. In case the employee loses his lien on the appointment he shall be entitled to be kept on the 'Badli' list.

Notwithstanding anything mentioned above, any employee who overstays his sanctioned leave or remains absent without properly approved leave will render himself liable for disciplinary action."

It is equally relevant to note that under Standing Order 16 continuous absence without permission and without satisfactory cause for more than 10 days is held to be mis-

conduct. Thus in the instant case if the workman can be said to be absent without permission or without satisfactory cause for more than 10 days the case falls under misconduct for which the Management has to necessarily hold a domestic enquiry into the charge and also comply with the provision of Section 33(2)(b) of the Act, if it chooses to dismiss him for the misconduct. What the Management held in this case was that the workman was sanctioned leave initially but he stayed away after the expiry of the leave period and did not return within 10 days nor gave any explanation. Thus according to the Management the case falls under Standing Order 11(c). Before adverturing to the contention raised by the learned counsel Mr. A. Lakshmana Rao for the Complainant it is necessary to advert to the aspect whether the Petitioner-Workman sent any information about his being shifted to Peddapally hospital or about his treatment at Peddapally hospital. The evidence of P.W. 1 is that on the evening of 5-4-1973 when he was being shifted to Peddapally hospital his mother informed the neighbour by name Sommanna Narsiah and requested him to inform the Management about it. The said Sommanna Narsiah is not examined to show that he informed the Manager. R.W. 2 would deny any information being given to him about the Petitioner being shifted to Peddapally Hospital. It is also not the case of the Petitioner that the Medical Officer of the Company dispensary at Godavari Khani referred him to Peddapally hospital. If that was so, even the Medical Officer of the Company Dispensary would have informed the Management about the shifting. Thus at that stage there was no information to the Management about the Petitioner being shifted to Peddapally Hospital. It is the evidence of P.W. 1 that while he was under treatment in Peddapally hospital he got a chit written by some one and sent it through P.W. 2 to the Management, thereby suggesting that he sought for extension of leave. P.W. 2 is examined to corroborate this. But the averment in Ex. R1 a petition filed by P.W. 1 dated 2-7-1973 would believe the fact that the Petitioner ever chose to send a letter or a chit for extension of leave. It is stated therein that after he took medicine in the Company's Dispensary upto 5-4-1973 he was not feeling well and he was forced to take medicines at his native place and where he fell ill and was taken to Peddapally hospital, and there he was unconscious for 10 days. The present version is that on 5-4-1973 evening itself he was taken from Godavari Khani to Peddapally and that within two or three days thereafter (as per the evidence of P.W. 2) P.W. 1 sent this chit. There is no reference in Ex. R1 to P.W. 1 sending the chit. On the other hand it is mentioned that while he was unconscious for 10 days his relatives informed the master to the Pit authorities. Thus the sending of a chit seeking extension of leave by P.W. 1 stands belied. It is also not the evidence of P.W. 2 that he orally informed any Pit authorities. Thus the recital in Ex. R1 contradicts the present version of P.W. 1 and P.W. 2 as to the sending of a chit. It is true that P.W. 1 would deny having given this petition Ex. R1 but in the petition filed here it stands clearly mentioned that on 2-7-1973 the Petitioner sent such a petition to the Management. Evidently P.W. 1 is trying to wriggle out of the contents of Ex. R1. In view of what is contained in Ex. R1 it can be said that the present version of P.W. 1 and P.W. 2 that a chit is sent to the Manager's office is an after-thought. Thus as a question of fact it can be said that the Petitioner did not even inform the authorities about his treatment at Peddapally hospital nor did he seek any extension of leave.

7. The strenuous contention of the learned counsel for the Petitioner Mr. Lakshmana Rao is the clause in the Standing Order relating to the loss of lien as contained in Standing Order 11(c) is applicable only to cases of leave sanctioned on an application, and that too with regard to earned leave with wages alone. He wants me to read the Standing Order 11(a)(b) and (c) together. Standing Order 11(a) and (b) read as follows —

- (a) LEAVE FACILITIES: Leave with wages shall be allowed to every person employed in a mine, who has completed a period of twelve months' continuous service therein as provided for in Chapter VII of the Mines Act 1952 and other holidays in accordance with law, contract, custom and usage.
- (b) Any direct employee of the Company who desires to obtain leave of absence shall apply in writing to the Head of the Department or the Manager of

the Colliery. If the leave asked for is granted, a leave pass shall be issued to the employee and unless this is received by the employee he must not leave his work. If leave is refused or postponed the fact of such refusal or postponement and the reasons therefor shall be recorded in writing in a leave Register to be maintained for this purpose and if the employee so desires a copy of such entry in the Register shall be supplied to him. If the employee after proceeding on leave desires an extension thereof he shall apply to the Head of the Department or the Manager of the Colliery who shall send a written reply either granting or refusing extension of leave to the employee if his address is available and if such reply is likely to reach him before the expiry of the leave originally granted to him."

The contention of Mr. Lakshmana Rao was thus two folds. The over stay after the period of leave granted refers to only the Earned Leave and that such leave must be one which is granted only on a written application. According to him in the present case there was no application given by the Workman in the first instance. Secondly the loss of lien would be attracted only in case of over-staying the period of earned leave with wages which would accrue as provided in Chapter VII of the Mines Act. Under this very heading leave facilities, other holidays in accordance with the law, contract and custom and usage stand mentioned. Clause (b) refers to the procedure of obtaining leave of absence. It does not specially refer as to earned leave with wages. This clause however lays down that the employee desiring to obtain leave of absence shall apply in writing which leave shall be refused or postponed. The point for consideration is whether the leave contemplated by Clause (b) is only confined to leave with wages as provided in Chapter VII of the Mines Act. In this context the learned counsel would also refer me to Chapter VIII of the recommendations of the Wage Board in Coal Mining Industry. Five types of leave are enumerated therein. They are privilege leave, casual leave, sick leave, paid festival holidays and leave without pay. While it is noted therein that privilege leave is governed by provisions of Chapter VII of the Mines Act, recommendation is made for paid 5 casual leaves in a year. Similarly with regard to sick leave the recommendation is for 15 days with full pay in a year. It is not contended by Mr. Lakshmana Rao that with regard to obtaining of leave other than Earned leave with wages there is any other provisions in the Standing Orders. If we are to accept his contention that Clause (b) of Standing Order 11(a) is restricted to only cases of Earned leave with pay, it means that where a workman wants to go on sick leave with or without wages or even on casual leave there is no provision in the Standing Order. It boils down to this, that where a workman is entitled for sick leave with or without wages and even casual leave there is no provision under the Standing Orders and it must be deemed that the workman is absent and that such an absenteeism constitutes a misconduct. To my mind that would lead to anomalous position. Clause (b) cannot be restricted only to cases of grant of Earned leave alone. Clause (a) therefore, cannot be said to govern Clause (b). In this view it can be held that Clause (b) takes into its ambit classes of application either it be for sick leave or casual leave either with pay or without pay and also the case of an Earned leave. The second contention in this regard is whether any leave was sanctioned initially to the Petitioner-workman. It is conceded by R.W. 2 that the workman did not make any application though he was admitted to the Company's dispensary. Clause (b) of course lays down that there must be a written application before an employee seeks leave of absence. It is the version of R.W.s. 1 and 2 that whenever an employee of this Company reports sick at the hospital of the Company the Medical Officer concerned would send an unfit certificate immediately to the Company-Management and from that date the workman is treated as sick.

P.W. 1 also admits that for the period they are under treatment of the Company's dispensary they would be deemed to be sick. Of course he would add that he does not know whether that period is treated as sick leave. It is the evidence of R.W. 1 that till the report of the Medical Officer, as to the fitness of a workman is received, the workman would be treated on sick leave for 15 days with pay and thereafter without pay. From the above admission of

P.W. 1 and the evidence of R.Ws. 1 and 2 it would emerge that a practice has grown in this Company where an employee on being admitted to the Company's Dispensary is treated as on sick leave. This practice which has almost substituted the Medical Officer's report for a written application from the employee seeking sick leave cannot be said to be an unreasonable one. In fact that is for the benefit of the workman, which saves the need for a written application in a state of agony of a workman. To argue that there was no initial application by the workmen in the instant case and thus there was no sanctioned leave initially does not appear to sound well when such a practice has been to the advantage of the workman. The argument might be convenient in the instant case, but it cannot yet be said that there was no sanctioned leave initially. It is the very report of the Medical Officer of the Company's Dispensary that from 5-4-1973 the workman has not been attending the Dispensary. The fact that in the Attendance Register the leave of the workman from 1-4-1973 to 5-4-1973 was not shown cannot be said to have any material bearing for the period of treatment of the workman from 27-3-1973 to 5-4-1973 is an admitted one. In the circumstances in view of the report of the Medical Officer about the unfitness of this workman from 27-3-1973 and as for the practice prevailing it can be said he was granted leave or sick leave. Thus initially sick leave was granted, and from 5-4-1973 till 22-4-1973 the workman did not return nor has given any satisfactory explanation. Thus the requirements of 11(c) of the Standing Orders can be said to be completed entailing the loss of lien on the appointment. It is not a case of absenteeism from the start so as to constitute the said absenteeism as a misconduct with regard to which the Management is bound to constitute a domestic enquiry. In the above view of the matter the intimation by the Management on 22-4-1973 that the workman lost his lien on his appointment on account of over-staying the leave originally granted is perfectly valid in terms of the Standing Orders. As the loss of lien is automatic, the intimation of the same by the Management does not amount to any contravention of the provisions of Section 33 of the Act. Consequently, the complaint under Section 33A is not maintainable. The complaint fails and it is therefore dismissed.

Award passed accordingly.

Dictated to the Stenographer, transcribed by him and corrected by me and pronounced in the open Court this the 19th July, 1974.

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

Witnesses examined for Petitioner.

P.W. 1 : Gurrala Muthyalu
P.W. 2 : Sainla Ramaswamy

Witnesses examined for Respondent.

R.W. 1 : D. P. Garg
R.W. 2 : Shashidhar Jha

Documents exhibited for Petitioner

Ex. P 1 : Copy of the representation dated 22-5-1973 of Sri Gurrala Muthyalu addressed to the Agent, Ramagundam Division II to allow him to resume on duty.

Ex. P 2 : Copy of the Medical Certificate dt. 6-4-73 issued by the Medical Officer, Government Hospital, Peddapalli to Sri Gurrala Muthyalu.

Ex. P 3 : Copy of the letter dt. 10-7-73 of Dy. General Manager, Ramagundam addressed to Sri Gurrala Muthyalu for his willingness to the post of Badli Filler.

Ex. P 4 : Copy of the letter dt. 15-7-73 of the Vice President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Godavari Khani addressed to the Deputy General Manager, Ramagundam Division, to take Gurrala Muthyalu on duty.

Documents exhibited for Respondent

Ex. R 1 : Mercy Petition dt. 2-7-73 of Sri Gurrala Muthyalu sent to the Deputy General Manager, Ramagundam to take him back on humanitarian ground.

Ex. R 2 : Letter dt. 18-4-73 of Medical Officer, Ramagundam Division addressed to the Manager, Godavari Khani No. 5 Incline stating that Gurrala Muthyalu was made unfit on 27-3-73 and attended on 5-4-1973 and since the he is not attending the dispensary for treatment.

Ex. R 3 : Termination Order dt. 22-4-73 issued by the Manager, Godavari Khani No. 5 Incline to Sri Gurrala Muthyalu.

Ex. R 4 : Second Mercy Petition dt. 12-7-73 of Sri Gurrala Muthyalu addressed to the Deputy General Manager, Ramagundam to take him back on duty.

Ex. R 5 : Letter dt. 17-7-73 of Dy. General Manager, Ramagundam addressed to Sri Gurrala Muthyalu stating that if he fail to accept the Badli Filler post within 15 days, he will be foreclosing his claim of Badli Filler.

I v R 6 . Letter dt. 15-7-73 of the Vice President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union, Godavari Khani addressed to the Dy. General Manager, Ramagundam Division to reinstate Gurrala Muthyalu

Ex. R 7 : Letter dt. 22-7-73 of Dy. General Manager, Ramagundam Collieries addressed to the Vice President, Tandur Coal Mines Labour Union Godavari Khani stating that the job of M.M. Operator of Sri Gurrala Muthyalu cannot be agreed to.

Ex. R 8 : List dt. 27-3-73 of Unfit persons sent by the Medical Officer, Ramagundam to the Manager, Godavari Khani No. 5 Incline in which Sri Gurrala Muthyalu is one.

Ex. R 9 : Letter dt. 18-4-73 of Senior Medical Officer, Ramagundam Division addressed to the Manager, Godavari Khani No. 5 Incline stating that Gurrala Muthyalu made unfit on 27-3-1973 and attended on 5-4-1973 since then he is not attending to dispensary for treatment.

Ex. R 10 : Register of leave wage account in which the sick leave entry and termination entry of Sri Gurrala Muthyalu were made.

T. NARSING RAO,
Presiding Officer,
[No. 7/21/67-I RII.]

P. R. NAYAR, Dy. Secy.

नई दिल्ली, 23 अगस्त, 1974

का० प्रा० 2314--परकारी स्थान (अप्राविहृत अधिभोगियों की वेदश्वली) अधिनियम, 1971 (1971 का 40) की धारा 3 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय मरकार, भारत मरकार के निर्माण और आवास भवालय की अधिगृहन सं. का० प्रा० 3622, नारीख 7 मिन्डर, 1971 में निम्नलिखित और संशोधन करती है, अर्थात् --

उक्त अधिगृहन के तीनों की मारणी में, स्तम्भ (1) में की प्रविष्टि के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा, अर्थात् --

'प्रणामनिक अधिकारी, कायदा व्यान भविष्य निधि मण्डन, धनंजाद, विहार।'

[मा० जी-20017(18)/70-पी०एफ 1]

राम प्रसाद नरेन्द्रा, अवार मन्त्री

New Delhi, the 23rd August, 1974

S.O. 2314.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 (40 of 1971), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Works

and Housing No. S.O. 3622, dated the 7th September, 1971,
namely:—

In the Table below the said notification, for the entry in
column (1), the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"Administrative Officer, Coal Mines Provident Fund Organisatior, Dhanbad, Bihar."

[No. G. 20017(18)/70-PF.]

R. P. NARULA, Under Secy.

आदेश

तर्फ दिल्ली, 5 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2315.—यथा केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इस से
उपायद्र अनुसूची में विनिविष्ट विषयों के बारे में मेसर्स इवान मिल्टिनो-
बिक पी आई पीम, वास्को-डो-गामा (गोवा) के प्रबन्धनत्व से सम्बद्ध नियोजकों
और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद विद्यमान है;

प्रौर यत्, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए
निर्देशित करना वाधनीय समझती है;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14)
की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के छठे (ध) द्वारा प्रवत शक्तियों का
प्रयाग घरत हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की
धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित केन्द्रीय सरकार औद्योगिक अधिकरण सं० 2,
मुम्बई को व्याय निर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुशूची

"क्या मेसर्स इवान मिल्टिनो-बिक -पी आई पीम, वास्को-डो-गामा (गोवा)
के प्रबन्धनत्व का अपने कर्मकारों को, निर्वाह-व्यय सूचकांक
में बद्दलती को देखते हुए परिवर्ती मंडगाई भता न देना व्यायोचित
है ? यदि नहीं, तो वे किस अनुशोष के हकदार हैं ?"

[सं० एल. 36011/10/74-पी एण्ड बी/एल आर० 3]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 5th August, 1974

S.O. 2315.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion
that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in
relation to the management of Messrs. Ivan Multinovic-PIM,
Vasco-da-Gama (Goa) and their workmen in respect of the
matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And, whereas, the Central Government considers it desirable
to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by
clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial
Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government
hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Central
Government Industrial Tribunal, No. 2, Bombay constituted
under section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of Messrs. Ivan Milltinovic-
PIM, Vasco-da-Gama (Goa) are justified in not
paying Variable Dearness Allowance to their work-
men in view of the increase in cost of living index ?
If not to what relief are they entitled ?"

[No. L. 36011/10/74/P&D/LR-III]

प्रावेश

तर्फ दिल्ली, 7 अगस्त, 1974

का० आ० 2316.—यथा केन्द्रीय सरकार की राय है कि इसमें उपायद्र
अनुसूची में विनिविष्ट विषयों के बारे में बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र, बुधवरपेठ, पूना
से सबध नियोजकों और उनके कर्मकारों के बीच एक औद्योगिक विवाद
विद्यमान है;

और यथा केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए
निर्देशित करना वाधनीय समझती है ;

अतः, अब, औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 (1947 का 14)
की धारा 10 की उपधारा (1) के छठे (ध) द्वारा प्रवत शक्तियों का
प्रयाग करते हुए, केन्द्रीय सरकार उक्त विवाद को उक्त अधिनियम की
धारा 7-क के अधीन गठित औद्योगिक अधिकरण, मुम्बई (सं० 2)
को व्यायनिर्णयन के लिए निर्देशित करती है।

अनुशूची

"क्या बैंक आफ महाराष्ट्र, बुधवरपेठ, पूना के प्रबन्धनत्व की, श्री
डी० टी० दुर्गुडे की ज्येष्ठता को अधिकांत करने और हवलदार के पद पर
प्रोत्सति के साथ से उसे वित्त करने की कार्रवाई व्यायोचित है ? यदि
नहीं, तो वह किस अनुशोष का हकदार है ?"

[सं० एल. 12012/11/74-एल० आर० 3]

ORDER

New Delhi, the 7th August, 1974

S.O. 2316.—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion
that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in
relation to the Bank of Maharashtra, Budhwarpeth, Poona
and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the
Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable
to refer the said dispute for adjudication:

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by
clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial
Dispute Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government
hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the
Industrial Tribunal, Bombay (No. 2), constituted under
section 7A of the said Act.

SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of the management of Bank of
Maharashtra, Budhwarpeth, Poona in superseding the
seniority of Shri D. T. Durgude and depriving him of the
benefit of the promotion to the post of Hawaldar is justified?
If not, to what relief is he entitled ?"

[No. L. 12012/11/74/LR III]

New Delhi, the 24th August, 1974

S.O. 2317.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial
Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947) the Central Government
hereby publishes the following award of Industrial Tribunal,
Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in
relation to the management of Messrs Darabshaw B. Cun-
setjee's Sons (Bombay) Private Limited, Bombay and their
workmen which was received by the Central Government
on the 17th August, 1974.

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, BOMBAY.

Reference No. CGIT-6 of 1972

PARTIES .

Employers in relation to M/s Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., Bombay

AND

Their Workmen

PRESENT :

Shri B. Ramlal Kishen, LL.M., Bar-at-Law, Presiding Officer

APPEARANCES :

For the employers —Shri K. M. Jamadar, Industrial Relations Consultant.

For the Workmen :—Shri K. R. Denle, Advocate.

STATE :—Maharashtra.

INDUSTRY.—Major Ports and Docks.

Bombay dated 26th July, 1974

AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour and Rehabilitation, Department of Labour and Employment by order No. L-31012/2/72-P&D dated 22nd November 1972 issued in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of subsection (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (14 of 1947) have referred to this Tribunal for adjudication an industrial dispute existing between the employers in relation to the management of M/s Darabshaw B. Cursetjee & Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., Bombay and their workmen in respect of the matter specified in the following schedule :

SCHEDULE

"Whether the management of M/s Darabshaw B. Cursetjee & Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Limited, 7, Kumpa Street, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1 are justified in dismissing from their services Shri S. Salaudin, permanent Assistant supervisor as from 21st June, 1972 by their order No. 1652/72/KMJ : CD, dated 21st June 1972 if not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?"

2 Pursuant to the notice issued by this Tribunal the union of the workmen filed its statement of claim in which it has been submitted that a complaint was lodged by Shri Rodricks, a dock clerk on 11th May, 1972 alleging that Shri Salaudin Assistant Supervisor entered the dock at 7:30 p.m. on 10th May 1972 and assaulted the said dock clerk and one Shri S. Pires who were on duty; consequently Shri Rodricks got injured and was sent to St. George's Hospital for injuries sustained on the right hand thumb. The Union has further submitted that Shri Salaudin was issued with a show cause notice for this alleged offence and although he categorically denied the offence the company charge-sheeted him on three counts viz., riotous or disorderly behaviour, assaulting, threatening and abusing the staff and wilful interference with the work of other persons. An enquiry was held and the enquiry officer held that the charges against Shri Salaudin were proved and he recommended his dismissal from service without payment of the wages from the date of suspension. The union has submitted that the order of dismissal should be set aside on the following among other grounds. The enquiry officer was so much biased against the worker that he himself recommended his dismissal although he had no authority to do so. The worker had objected to the present enquiry officer holding the enquiry but he still held the enquiry and the enquiry was thus vitiated ab-initio. The union has finally contended that the enquiry was thus held against the principles of natural justice and the worker should be reinstated with back wages and costs should be granted.

3. The company in its written statement has admitted the incident leading to the issue of the show cause notice charge-sheet and holding of the enquiry and dismissal of the workman. They have however denied the alleged bias of the enquiry officer against the workman. They have denied that the delinquent worker objected to the enquiry officer holding the enquiry. It is also denied that the delinquent worker ever complained orally or in writing about the protest of the enquiry. While admitting that the enquiry officer had recommended the dismissal of the delinquent workman it is submitted that it was open to the Directors of the company to abide by the recommendations of the enquiry officer or not. They have also contended that the extreme punishment of dismissal meted out to the worker is fair and proper in the interest of justice, discipline and fair play. In conclusion it has been submitted that the order of dismissal dated 21st June 1972 against the delinquent is proper and should not be set aside and he should not be reinstated with back wages and costs should be awarded to the company.

4. Before this Tribunal the delinquent workmen has been examined as a witness through whom the following documents were filed :—

Exhibit W—1 Memo dated 1-5-1972 given to the delinquent by the company.

Exhibit W—2 reply dated 15-5-72 given by the delinquent to the company.

Exhibit W—3 charge-sheet dated 16-5-1972.

Exhibit W—4 Reply of the delinquent to the charge-sheet.

Exhibit W—5 Enquiry proceedings filed before the Tribunal together with the findings

Exhibit W—6 Dismissal order dated 21.6.1972

Exhibit W—7 Protest letter from the delinquent dated 25-5-72

Exhibit W—8 dated 4-9-72 is the justification by the delinquent before the Conciliation Officer

The employers have examined Shri Luis Roque, the Manager and has filed through him exhibits E-1 to E-13.

5. In order to appreciate the controversy, certain facts may be stated at the outset. Shri Salauddin was a permanent Assistant Supervisor of the employers. He was served with a Memo dated 11th May 1972 relating to the incident at 21 Indira Docks during the second shift on 10th May 1972. The memo was issued on the basis of a complaint made by the Supervisor, Indira Docks and Shri A. Rodricks, Dock Clerk. In the memorandum it was stated that they had received a complaint from Shri Rodricks, Dock Clerk who was on duty at the same shed, that Shri Salauddin who was in a drunken state misbehaved with him and he threw away the heavy lift books which were on the table in the shed and when the table clerk was making an attempt to lift these books he threatened him with dire consequences and flung an empty bottle at him which the said clerk avoided by ducking. In spite of this the table clerk lifted the books and placed them on the table as he had to obtain the signatures from the Chief Officers. Shri Salauddin caught hold of him and dealt him a very severe fist blow and while he made an attempt to avoid the attack Shri Salauddin chased him and caught hold of him and twisted his right hand as a result of which his thumb was dislocated, and he was sent in an ambulance to the hospital for treatment. A show-cause notice dated 11th May, 1972 was then issued to Salauddin to which he gave his reply dated 15th May 1972 denying the allegations made against him. It appears from the record that on 11th May 1972 a complaint was lodged by Shri Rodricks, Dock Clerk that although Shri Salauddin was not on duty on the second shift he illegally entered the docks and threatened Shri Rodricks who was on duty. It is further alleged that Shri Salauddin assaulted Shri Rodricks as result of which he sustained an injury in his right hand thumb. Shri Salauddin was then charge-sheeted and three charges were framed against him under the standing orders:—

1 Riotous or disorderly behaviour at near the place of work or within the premises of the office or godown

2. Assaulting - threatening or abusing the staff of the Board, Administrative Body, Employer, Supervisory staff, ship's officers or crew or co-workers or other workmen connected with the dock work.
- 3 Wilful interference with the work of other workmen or persons.

6. Shri K. M. Jamadar was appointed enquiry officer. At the enquiry held on 25th May 1972 Shri Salauddin denied all the charged and placed not guilty. On the same day the enquiry officer examined the complainant Shri Rodricks. On 16th June 1972 Shri S. Peeris, Assistant Supervisor was examined and also Shri Poonawalla Supervisor and Shri L. Mohatta Booking clerk. Shri Visant Tukaram Kuvaie, temporary sewing man was also called and examined. Shri Salauddin was then questioned by the enquiry officer. He denied the allegations but did not produce any witnesses or documents in defence of his case. On the three charges framed against the delinquent the enquiry officer gave the findings that Shri Salauddin was not justified in entering the docks on 10th May 1972 nor was he justified in asking for permission to change the official documents. He held that Salauddin assaulted Shri S. Peeris and of Shri A. Rodricks who were on duty on 10th May 1972. He held that the delinquent was not justified in interfering with the work of other co-workers on duty and he was guilty of riotous or disorderly behaviour and was threatening and insinuating. The enquiry officer concluded that the charges levelled against Shri Salauddin were conclusively proved beyond doubt and recommended his dismissal from service forthwith and that he should not be paid his wages from the date of his suspension viz., 11th May 1972, and he was dismissed from service on 21st June 1972.

7. Various contentions were advanced before me by learned Counsel for the workman assailing the order of dismissal alleging bias against the enquiry officer appointed by the employers. The first grievance of the learned Counsel was that in this case the prosecutor and the judge was the same person. No one appeared on behalf of the company to examine witnesses. It is first of all argued that the applicant had submitted an application dated 25th May 1972 that the enquiry officer bore a grudge against him and the enquiry officer should have therefore stayed his hands. Even when such an imputation was made against him the enquiry officer was not charged. This caused considerable prejudice to the applicant. It is then maintained that the enquiry officer is a retainer of the company and as such he could not have been an independent person conducting the enquiry. It is argued that the enquiry officer had put leading questions to the witnesses and had disallowed the question put to the complainant as to whom he had seen on the 20th May 72. It is further urged that a question was put to the workman about his consuming liquor which fact was not disclosed by any witness and the enquiry officer has imported his personal knowledge into the matter. It is also contended that copies of the complaint filed by Rodricks and S. Peeris were not furnished to the delinquent but they were only shown to him at the time of the enquiry which has sufficiently prejudiced him and vitiated the enquiry. Reliance is placed by the learned Counsel for the workman on 1963 II LLJ P.375, 1963 II LLJ P.792 and 1966 II LLJ P.350. On the other hand learned Counsel for the employers has put forward contentions rebutting the arguments of the workman. It is submitted that the enquiry was held in consonance with the principles of natural justice and every opportunity was afforded to the workman to meet his charge. The witnesses were examined in the presence of the delinquent and he had every opportunity to cross-examine the witnesses. The learned Counsel for the employers who was the enquiry officer asserts that he had no enmity with the delinquent and it was a baseless allegation and further it is argued that the application of the delinquent dated 25th May 1972 was subsequently contrived and surreptitiously the seal of the company was obtained on it. It is contended that the fact that the enquiry officer was Counsel for the employers could not have disabled him from acting as the enquiry officer. He denies having put leading questions to the witnesses and asserts that the complaints made by the witnesses were made known to the delinquent. It is pleaded that the enquiry officer had given a detailed report analysing the evidence before him and only when he came to the conclusion that the applicant was guilty that the enquiry officer recommended the punishment of dismissal.

8. The principles governing domestic enquiries have been laid down in a number of decisions of the Supreme Court which may be summarised as follows:-

- 1 A domestic enquiry must be held by an unbiased person. In other words the person who holds the enquiry should not be biased in favour of or against either of the parties.
- 2 A domestic enquiry must be conducted honestly and bona fide with a view to determine whether the charge framed against a particular employee is proved or not and care must be taken to see that these enquiries do not become empty formalities.
- 3 A domestic enquiry should be held with scrupulous regard for the requirements of the rules of natural justice as question of bona fides or mala fides of the employers are at issue.
- 4 The employee proceeded against should be informed clearly of the charges levelled against him
- 5 The evidence on which the charge is sought to be proved must be led in such enquiry in the presence of the workman himself.
- 6 The employee must be given a fair opportunity to hear the evidence in support of the charge and to cross-examine the witnesses produced against him and also to rebut the evidence led against him by examining witness including himself if he so wishes on any relevant matter.
- 7 The enquiry officer should clearly and precisely record his conclusions indicating briefly his reasons for reaching said conclusions.

In the light of the above principles I now approach the decision of the question before me.

9. The grievance made by the learned Council for the applicant is that the enquiry officer was a prosecutor and judge at the same time, and it has caused prejudice to him is without any foundation. It was not incumbent on the management to appoint a person for the purpose of examining the witness before the enquiry officer for it was purely a domestic enquiry which does not call for any cumbersome procedure. The arguments of the learned Council for the applicant, imputing bias to the enquiry officer merely on the ground that he was a lawyer retained by the company is completely erroneous and cannot be sustained. It is well known as was pointed by the Supreme Court in 1954 II LLJ 140 [Saran motois (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi and Vishwanath and another] that enquiries of this type are generally conducted by the officers of the employer and in the absence of any special individual bias attributable to a particular officer it has never been held that the enquiry is bad just because it is conducted by an officer of the employer. If that be so it is obviously unsound to take the view that a lawyer who is not a paid officer of the employer is incompetent to hold the enquiry because he is the employer's lawyer and is paid remuneration for holding the enquiry. On this ground the findings of the enquiry officer cannot be reversed.

10. I find it equally bereft of substance the argument of the learned Counsel for the workman that because a copy of the complaint of Shri Rodricks was not given to the delinquent before the enquiry is vitiated. No witnesses were previously examined by the employer except before the enquiry officer. It is true that the complaint made by Shri Rodricks was not given to the delinquent before the enquiry and the application sent by Shri Peeris was shown to the delinquent only at the time of the enquiry. But it cannot be said that any prejudice would have been caused to the applicant due to this omission as the contents of the complaint made by Rodricks and Peeris found their way in the charge-sheet and the delinquent could have well cross-examined the complainant and the witnesses keeping in view the recitals in the charge-sheet. It cannot therefore be said that the enquiry on that score is vitiated. My view gains support by the judgment of the Bombay High Court reported in 1967 II LLJ 375.

11. I cannot accede to the argument of the learned Counsel for the workman that it was incumbent on the enquiry officer

to have examined the police officer to whom the complaint was made by the complainant and he should have summoned the medical officer who treated the complainant in the hospital. Domestic enquiries are not conducted strictly adhering to the rules of the Evidence Act. At best the evidence of the Medical Officer and the Police Officer would have lent support to the statement of the complainant. Besides the enquiry officer could not have compelled the attendance of the Medical Officer and the Police. This contention is accordingly repelled.

12. After having perused the record I could not discover any question put as a leading question by the enquiry officer. Even assuming that leading questions have been put it does not violate the rules of natural justice as was pointed out by the Bombay High Court in 1963 ILLJ 797.

13. Having given my anxious consideration to the evidence placed on record I am unable to uphold the conclusion arrived at by the enquiry officer that the charges against the delinquent are duly proved. Before advertizing to the evidence in this case I must state at the outset that the enquiry officer was not justified in proceeding with the enquiry in view of the application made by the delinquent workman dated 25th May 1972 exhibit w-7. In that application the workman had made it clear that he was not on good terms with the enquiry officer due to previous incidents and he had also been in close contact with the complainant Shri Rodricks. He had therefore expressed fears that the enquiry officer would not conduct a fair and proper enquiry. It was merely the ipse dixit of the learned Counsel for the employers that this application was not received by them and it appears to be a connected document. The application bears the seal of the employers and no effort whatever was made by the employers to establish that such an application was not received by them and it is not entered in the register of the applications maintained by them. It was open to the employers to have produced the relevant register and shown that such an application was not received by them but no such thing was done. It is idle therefore on the part of the learned Counsel for the employers to pretend that the seal was surreptitiously obtained by the delinquent workman and fixed on the application, without there being any positive material on record in support of such a belated plea. In the face of such an application the enquiry officer should have abstained from conducting the enquiry and the employers should have appointed another person to conduct the enquiry, however untrue or unjustified the allegation of the employee may be. For after all it is an accepted axiom of law that justice must not only be done but appears to have been done which has been flouted in this case. This introduce a serious infirmity in the enquiry conducted by the enquiry officer and it cannot by any stretch of imagination be said that the enquiry conducted was fair and in consonance with the principles of natural justice.

14. Now it has to be seen whether the evidence has been properly appraised by the enquiry officer. There can be no manner of doubt that in view of the introduction of section 11A of the Industrial Disputes Act the Industrial Tribunal is now empowered to consider the evidence in the domestic enquiry and satisfy itself whether such evidence relied upon by the employer established the misconduct alleged against the workman. The limitations imposed on the powers of the Tribunal by the decision in Indian Iron and Steel Co. Ltd., case (1958 I.I.L.J. 260) can no longer be invoked by the employer. The Tribunal, as pointed out by the Supreme Court in 1973 I.I.L.J. 278 is now at liberty to consider not only whether the finding of misconduct recorded by an employer is correct but also to differ from the said finding if a proper case is made out. What was once largely in the realm of the satisfaction of the employer has ceased to be so and now it is the satisfaction of Tribunal that finally decided the matter.

15. Keeping in view the above observations I have now to see whether the evidence in this case has been correctly appraised by the enquiry officer. The answer is clearly in the negative. The evidence that was placed before the enquiry officer was full of material discrepancies and suffers from inherent defects and these defects to my mind have been liberally ignored by the enquiry officer. In his application exhibit F-1 not a word is mentioned by the complainant about the presence of Shri Peeris at the time of the incident and also of the presence of Basant Tukaram

Kuvare or Mohatta. Further there is not a whisper in exhibit E-1 by Shri Rodricks about the assault made on Peeris by the delinquent. Curiously enough not a word is said in the complaint exhibit E-2 by Peeris about his being assaulted. In his evidence before the enquiry officer Shri Rodricks for the first time states about the delinquent giving 2 or 3 fist blows to Shri Peeris. In his evidence also no reference is made to the presence of Shri Vasant Tukaram Kuvare and Shri Mohatta at the time of the incident. Further Shri Peeris although not having stated in his application exhibit E-2 about his being assaulted by the delinquent for the first time introduces the story in his statement before the enquiry officer so that it could be in accordance with the version of Shri Rodricks that Shri Salauddin hit him on his left shoulder and denies having given any fist blows on his face. But in cross-examination by the delinquent he deposed that the assault took place at 7.30 p.m. on 10th May. He further says that the delinquent tapped him but he thought he was doing it by way of fun. This fully exposes the false nature of the evidence tendered in the enquiry by Rodricks and Peeris. This does not stand alone. Shri Peeris in exhibit E-2 has categorically stated that the above incident took place in his presence and he was an eye witness and along with him Shri Vasant Tukaram temporary sewing man and Shri Motha, foreman booking clerk were also present. But Shri Mohatta booking clerk denies having witnessed the occurrence and has stated that he did not witness the occurrence and only he learned about the incident from Shri Rodricks. Shri Vasant Tukaram the other witness examined at the enquiry says that although he saw Salauddin assaulting Rodricks he did not see him throwing a bottle at Rodricks. This is contrary to the statement of Shri Rodricks who says that first of all the bottle was thrown at him and then he was assaulted and then he was chased by Salauddin and caught hold of his right arm with the result that he was in great agony and pain. But strangely enough Vasant Tukaram Kuvare does not see Shri Salauddin throwing a bottle at Rodricks although he was present at the place of the incident. Not a word is said by Shri Vasant Tukaram Kuvare about Shri Salauddin chasing Rodricks and catching hold of his right arm and twisting him and as a result his right thumb getting dislocated and Salauddin trying to kick Rodricks in the Ilio region and the kick missing him and hitting him in the left thigh. Not a word about this is said also by Shri Peeris in his application exhibit E-2. He merely states that Salauddin Picked up the empty bottle and threw at Rodricks and the aim was missed and immediately Salauddin gave a blow on his face and start fighting unnecessarily and Shri Rodricks started running out of the shed out of fear.

16. These vital discrepancies occurring in the statements of the witnesses clearly are sufficient to disown their evidence. The enquiry officer was not justified in placing reliance on their evidence and coming to the conclusion that the guilt of the delinquent has been conclusively proved meriting his dismissal.

17. There is another lacuna to be found in the enquiry which relates to the question of punishment. No show cause notice was given to the delinquent workman before the order of dismissal was passed against him by the company. Though the requirements of Article 311 of the Constitution would not strictly apply to disciplinary action against industrial employees it is but fair that the workman is given an opportunity to show cause why the proposed punishment should not be inflicted upon him. In case of industrial enquiries more care has to be taken to protect workman firstly because often times industrial workers are illiterate and secondly because the bona fides or mala fides of an employer are always in question in such enquiries. There may be extenuating circumstances such as clean and unblemished record of the workmen which the enquiry officer might have lost sight of. The workman may be able to bring such factors in his favour to the notice of the punishing authority. The punishment was disproportionately severe keeping in view the evidence placed before the enquiry officer.

18. Considering the aforesaid reasons I cannot sustain the order of dismissal against the delinquent Shri Salauddin. It has to be set aside. I therefore hold that the management of M/s. Darabshaw B. Cursetjee's Sons (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., 7 Kumta Street, Ballard Estate, Bombay-1, are not justified in dismissing from their services Shri S. Salauddin, permanent Assistant Supervisor as from 21st June, 1972 by their Order No.1652/72/KMJCP dated 21st June, 1972.

19. The second point that has to be answered in this reference is to what relief the workman is entitled. As the dismissal of the workman has been set aside he will be deemed to have continued in service and the normal relief to be granted is the relief of reinstatement. I therefore direct that Shri Salauddin should be reinstated to his former post of Assistant Supervisor with the employers from the date of dismissal i.e. 21st June 1972 with continuity of service and back wages. The reference is answered accordingly.

No order as to costs.

B. RAMLAL KISHEN, Presiding Officer,

[No. L-31012/2/72-P&D/CMT.]

G. C. SAKSENA, Under Secy.

पूर्ण और पुनर्वास मन्त्रालय

(पुनर्वास विभाग)

नई दिल्ली, 14 अगस्त, 1974

का० प्रा० 2318.—विस्थापित व्यक्ति (प्रतिकर तथा पुनर्वास) अधिनियम, 1954 (1954 की 44) की धारा 3 की उपधारा (1) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए केंद्रीय सरकार इसके द्वारा पंजाब सरकार के पुनर्वास विभाग में सहायक बन्दीबस्त आयुक्त, श्री गुरदेव सिंह को उस अधिनियम के द्वारा या उसके अन्तर्गत बन्दीबस्त आयुक्त को सौन्दर्य गण (1) मुआवजा पूल के भाग की किसी भी ग्रामीण ज़िले में स्थित कृषि भूमि तथा बुकाने जिनमें मकान पशु-बालाएं तथा बाली स्थान शामिल हैं और (II) भारत सरकार के तत्कालीन नियमण, आवाल और

पुनर्वास मन्त्रालय (पुनर्वास विभाग) की अधिसूचना संख्या 3(37) /एस एवं मार/63-ए, वित्तक 5 मार्च, 1964 में जनित्रित भम्पत्तियों से संबंधित कायदों को निष्पादित करते के लिए पंजाब राज्य के लिए बन्दीबस्त आयुक्त के रूप में नियुक्त करती है।

[संख्या 15/6/74-विशेष सेवा/एस०एस०-४]

बीनानाम असीजा, अवर सचिव

MINISTRY OF SUPPLY & REHABILITATION

(Department of Rehabilitation)

New Delhi, the 14th August, 1974

S.O. 2318.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Gurdev Singh, Assistant Settlement Commissioner in the Rehabilitation Department of Punjab Government, as Settlement Commissioner in the State of Punjab for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to a Settlement Commissioner by or under the said Act in respect of (i) agricultural lands and shops in any rural area including houses, cattle-sheds and vacant sites forming part of the Compensation Pool and (ii) the properties referred to in the Notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation, (Department of Rehabilitation) No.3(37)/L&R/63-A dated the 5th March, 1964.

[No. 15/6/74-Spl. Cell/SSIV.]

D. N. ASIJA, Under Secy.

